

OF THE
HOLINESSE
OF
CHURCH-MEMBERS.

By JOHN COTTON Teacher of
the Church of Christ in Boston in
NEW-ENGLAND.

Pfal. 9. 5.

Holinesse becometh thine house O Lord for ever.

Pfal. 15. 1, 2.

*Lord who shall sojourn in thy tabernacle, who shall dwell in thy holy
hill?*

He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness.



L O N D O N :

Printed by F. N. for Hanna Allen, and are to be sold at
the Crown in Popes-head Alley. 1650.

OF THE HOLINESS OF CHURCH MEMBERS.

By JOHN COTTON, Teacher of
 the Church of Christ in B. 17.
 NEW ENGLAND.

He that walketh uprightly, and worketh right
 will
 Lord and shall possess in his inheritance, and shall dwell in his day.
 Psalm 119: 171.



LONDON:
 Printed by R. N. for James Allen, and are to be sold at
 the Crown in Pope-head Alley. 1690.

TO MY HONORED, WORSHIPFULL,
and worthy Friends, the Major, and Justices, the
Aldermen and Common Councell, together with the
whole Congregation and Church at Boston.
Mercy, Peace, and Truth be multiplied
in Christ Jesus.

Honoured and dear Friends,

IN that twenty years Service, (or thereabouts) wherein according
to the call of God and you, I fed his flock amongst you, and
his, and your lambs (as Jacob did Laban for the like space,
Gen. 31. 38.) I do with thankfulness acknowledge to God, and
you, you have not dealt with me (as Laban with him) grudging-
ly, and deceitfully: but rather (as the Macedonians dealt with Paul) you
gave up your own selves, first to the Lord; and then to your Ministers by
the will of God: 2 Cor. 8. 5. And ye became followers of us, and of the Lord,
and shewed your selves ensamples, in some first fruits of Reformation; unto
many neighbour Congregations about you: 1 Thes. 1. 6, 7. And though ye saw
that any small measure of Reformation (which then was offensive to the State,
and suffered under the name of Non-conformity) would expose your selves
to some suffering; yet I hear you record, you chose rather
to expose your selves to charge and hazard for many year together, than to expose
my Ministry to silence. And though at the last, in that booke and power of
darknesse, when the late High Commission began to stretch forth their maligne
arms against us, I was forced (as Jacob did from Laban) to depart
creeping from you, (from some of you I say) without the consent of the chief;
yet sundry of you yielded up your selves (as did also David)
to follow the Lord whither soever he should call, and to go along with us;
whether to life or death, in this (late) howling wilderness; And though after
my departure you were somewhat carried aside, with the torrent of the times;
yet I believe, not without some apprehensions of the light of the word going be-
fore you, in your judgements, to the satisfaction of your own consciences. And
even since that time wherein the strong hand of the Lord, and the malignancy
of the times, had set this vast distance of place, and great gulf of Sea between
us; yet still you claimed an interest in me, and have yearly ministred, some real
testimony of your love: and at last when the Lord (of his rich grace) had dis-
pelled the storme of malignant Church-government, you invited me again and
again, to return to the place and work wherein I had walked, before the Lord
and you in former times. But the estate of those of you, who came along with me,

And who thereby had most interest in me could not but that: nor would my
relation to the Church here suffer it: Nor would my Age now stricken in years,
nor my weak body ill brooking the Sea be able to undergo it, without extreme
perill of becoming utterly unserviceable, either to your selves or others. Besides,
the estate of our Church, admitting more then professed Saints to the fellowship
of the seals, and the government of your Church subjected to an extrinsecall Ec-
clesiasticall power would have been a perpetuall scruple and torment to my con-
science, which knowing the terrors of the Lord, and the conviction of my own
judgement, I durst not venture upon. Not that I misjudge others, who can sa-
tisfie their consciences in a larger latitude: but because every man is to be fully
perswaded in his own minde, and I must live by my own faith. Rom. 14. 22.
Neverthelesse touching the former of these (the true estate of Church mem-
bers, and what is the business required of them) that you may see I am not
troubled with groundlesse scruples about it; I have for the satisfaction of your
several and sundry queries who have written to me about the same, penned
this ensuing Treatise, Of the Holiness of Church members, wherein if
the Lord should be pleased to reach forth, any satisfaction to your selves, I hope it
would tend much, if not towards union, yet towards a mutuall communion be-
tween your own Church, and the sister Congregational Church which (I hear)
the Lord Jesus hath planted amongst you. For if both of you could consent in
that qualification of your Church members which this Treatise pleadeth for,
the other scruple which concerneth the subjection of your Church to an extrinsec-
all Church power might easily be well eased, if not wholly removed, in such a
way as this. The Elders of your neighbour Churches (who were wont to be fa-
vourable to the Church at Bolton) may they would accept your Elders into fel-
lowship of publick consultation with them about Church affairs: so they might
give your Elders counsell in matters that concern your own Church, and the mem-
bers thereof, and leave the transacting and execution thereof to your own Elders,
in the presence and with the consent of your own Church. And who can tell how
much and how far the Lord might stretch forth the blessing of such a peaceable
condescendency, to more generall acceptance, and accommodation? Surely the
Lord hath done great things for you in your late marvellous deliverances, when
an Army of Malignants passed and returned by you, and might easily have
swallowed you up quick, if the Lord himself had not encamped about you. The
pondering of Gods goodness to you herein, brought to my minde, the former like
dealing of God with his people, Zach. 9. 8. And wherefore hath the Lord thus
saved you (as a firebrand out of the burning) but that you might live to the advance-
ment of his kingdom, in exemplary Truth and Peace. The same good hand of the Lord still
protect and direct you, in all your holy and civill administrations, in Christ Jesus. In
whom saluting you all, and all your relations, I take leave and rest,

Once your unworthy Pastor, ever your faithfull
Servant in Christ,
John Cotton.



QUEST: I.
Of the holinesse of Church-members.

CHAP. I.
The state of the Question.

SECT. I.
How far we Consent.

IT is Consented to on both sides, That Christians truly regenerate by the word and Spirit of grace, and none but such, are the Members of the Invisible Church, as it hath been commonly taken, for the society of the living members of the my-
sticall body of Christ.

2. That it is the duty of all the members of the particular visible Church, and necessarie (both *necessitate precepti, & medii*) both by Divine Commandment, and as a necessary means of their own salvation, to be truly regenerate, and sanctified in Christ Jesus. *Job. 3. 5. Psal. 15. throughout.*

3. That it is earnestly to be wished, and by all lawfull means diligently to be indeavoured both by Pastors and people, that all the members of the Church should be most holy and gracious. *Mr. Bailly, Disswafve, Chap. 7. pag. 156.*

4. That such as are born of Christian parents, and baptized in their infancy into the fellowship of the Church, are initiated members of the same Church, though destitute of spirituall grace, untill they justly deprive themselves of the priviledge of that Fellowship. For even of such is the kingdom of God. *Mar. 10. 14.*

5. That though it be comfortable, and desiraeable in the ad-
mission

mission of members into the Church, when the whole Church and all the members thereof are satisfied in the sincerity of the regeneration of such who are to be received, (especially in the first gathering and plantation of a Church:) yet neither in judgment, nor practise do we suspend their admission, till we be convinced in our consciences, of the certain and infallible signes of their regeneration.

6. That the hipocrisie of sundrie members in the Church, and the toleration of some open scandals therein, doth not forthwith take away the nature of the Church. For there must be a time to proceed orderly against them, which if neglected, though it do defile the purity of a Church, and without repentance will in time subvert it, yet not till after some time of Gods patience. *Revel. 2. 4, 5. and Chap. 3. 1, 2. and Chap. 2. 21.*

7. That notwithstanding the discovery of hipocrisie in sundrie members of the Church, and the toleration of some open scandals: yet separation is not forthwith to be made from the Church. For it may be a sin of infirmity in the Church: and we are to proceed with patience against the infirmity of a brother, much more of a whole Church. By hasty withdrawing, Reformation is not procured, but retarded.

8. That if a man cannot continue in the fellowship of the Church where he hath lived, but shall be constrained to yeeld unto some sin, or shall see no hope of reformation of evils, after long waiting, and all good means used, we suppose, none will deny a man liberty in such a case to withdraw himself, so it be without condemnation of that Church, from whence he withdraweth, unlesse the Church fall into fundamentall heresies and blasphemies, and persist therein (after conviction) out of malicious wickednesse.

9. When a man is to make his choice, unto what Church to joyn himself, we suppose no man will deny him this liberty, to joyn himself to such a Church, as he findeth most pure, and watchfull, and powerfull in the administration of the ordinances of Christ.

SECT. II.

The state of the Question mistaken, by Mr. Bailly, and Apollonius.

Mr. Bailly in his *Dispassive* from the errors of the Times, taketh our judgement and practise to be quite contrary to what we have declared above, in the 5. 6. 7. Positions, and accordingly undertaketh to dispute against our judgement and practise herein. But I know no ground he hath had from us here, either so to report us, or so to refute us; howbeit, in his Refutation, some things are delivered by him, which may justly require some further revisal.

The like mistake of us, I finde in *Apollonius*, in the stating of his first Question. Neverthelesse I blame neither of them, seeing (it may be) they have met with some of the Separation, who haply have sostated the Question, though (for ought I know) none of us.

SECT. III.

The stating of the Question by Mr. Rutterford considered.

Mr. Rutterford maketh way for clearing the state of the Question, by some distinctions, and some conclusions, and (in the way) by answering some questions; in Chap. 9. of his *Peaceable Plea*.

His Distinctions (pag. 93, 94.) are ten, whereof eight of them I should not refuse: onely the eighth and tenth I cannot so readily accept, without some subdistinction. Let it be considered (saith he in his tenth Distinction) if a Church may not be tearmed by the Spirit of God, an whore, no Church, no Spouse, jure, & merito, & quoad vocationem passivam, in respect of bad deserving, and their not Answering to the call of God on their parts: and yet that some Church remain de facto, formaliter, & quoad vocationem Dei activam, formally, and on Gods part, in regard of his active vocation and calling, the Spouse and Bride of Christ.

This distinction I can admit, if it be understood of a Church, that hath formerly answered the call of God, and submitted to the ministry of the Gospel at least in outward profession, of the fundamentals of sound doctrine and pure worship. For such a Church, though they or their children may afterwards degene-

rate, and go an whoring from God in doctrine and worship; yet God (in his patience and bounty) is not wont so soon to cast off them, as they cast off him. The next generation after *Joshuab* went an whoring from God, and forsook the Lord God of their fathers, and served *Baalim*, and *Ashtaroth*: yet still the Lord accounted them his people, and sent them Judges and Prophets to restore, and recover them.

But if a society of men should have the word of God truly taught unto them, and be thereby externally called to the fellowship of Christ, and of his Church, and yet be never wrought upon to submit themselves to the call of God, no not in outward profession, I durst not account such a society for a Spouse and Church of God, notwithstanding Gods active externall calling of them. And therefore his first Conclusion hence deduced, I dare not accept. *That Saints by externall calling (such a calling, whereto no Answer at all is given) are the true matter of a visible Church.*

For this Conclusion implyeth within it self a contradiction: here is indeed an externall calling, but here be no Saints (no not in outward profession) accepting that Calling. Now looke as an inward calling doth not constitute an invisible Church, without an inward answering of that call: so neither doth an externall calling constitute a visible Church, without an externall answer of that call; neither are they Saints by externall calling, who do not externally answer the call offered to them.

With the same subdistinction (if I may so call it) I would accept his 8. Distinction. For where a people have formerly covenanted to professe, and confesse the faith of Christ according to God, the Magistrate may compell them *actu imperante* on his part (*imperato*, on theirs) to stand to their profession, as *Jesiah* dealt with the Israelites, *2 Chron.* 34. 33. But where people never covenanted to professe the faith, I see not how a Magistrate can compell them, to undertake such a profession. *David* did not compell his tributary subjects, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Syrians, Philistines, to professe the faith, or Religion of the God of Israel.

Mr. *Rutherford*s Reasons to make good his first Conclusion will reach so far as hath been said, but no further.

1. *The word Ecclesia* (saith he) *the called of God* proveth this: For those are a true visible Church, where God hath set up a Candlestick: and whom

whom God calleth to repentance, to remission of sins, and life eternall in Christ: because there is a settled Ministry Calling.

Ans. Where God setteth up a Candlestick, there is indeed a true visible Church: for the Candlestick is the Church, especially if it be of gold (though mingled with much drosse) *Rev. 1. 20.* but not every where, where God setteth up a Candle, doth he also set up a Candlestick. *Paul* was set up for a Candle in Arabia 3. yeers together, *Gal. 1. 17, 18.* but whether God settled any Candlestick, or Church there, it is not certain: certainly it is not recorded amongst the Acts of the Apostles.

Yet I should not refuse (according to the former Distinction) that where there hath been a Church before, which hath yeelded professed subjection to the Gospel of Christ, then in case a settled Ministry be still continued there, God still continueth a true visible Church there; because he hath not called away his Embassadors from them, but still stretcheth out his hand (though it may be) to a rebellious and gainsaying people, *Rom. 10. 21.* And very probable it is, that where God continueth a settled Ministry of the Gospel or doctrine of grace, there though many may be rebellious, yet still some remnants are found, who gladly receive the word, and submit to it: and more, who profess it.

But if there be an universall resistance of the Call, given by the ministry of the Word, as there was in those invited guests, (*Luk. 14. 18.*) when they all with one accord began to make excuse, though *Ecclesia* be *Cetus vocatorum*, yet I dare not beleieve that such a *Cetus vocatorum*, is, *Ecclesia*. For the Church is a company of called ones, not by men onely, whose Call may be altogether rejected; but of God, who by calling maketh such impression upon the hearts of men, as convinceth them of the voice of God in the Word, and subdueth them to yeeld subjection to the Word, though not sincerely, yet at least feinedly, and in hypocrisie, *Psal. 18. 44.*

But if there be no Answer at all, no not in outward profession, it is not such a Call, as denominateth the hearers to be *Cetus vocatorum*; no, not though that externall call be given by a settled Ministry. For what if a religious State should provide to settle a preaching Ministry in every Parish in *Ireland*, it is not the settled Ministry, nor the externall call given by that Ministry to repentance,

Of the Holinesse of Church-members.

repentance, remission of sins, and life eternall in Christ, that will make the malignant refractory hearers *Cetum vocatorum*, such as may denominate them to be a Church. And therefore his

2d: Reason will not hold, no more then the first, which is: *Because all to whom the word is preached are called the visible Church: as all within the house are the vessels within the house visibly, though there be in the house vessels of honour, and vessels of dishonour.*

For we safely deny, that all to whom the word is preached are called the visible Church. For then might many Indians, and wilde Irish be called the visible Church. All within the house are not of the house, no not in visible appearance: much lesse are all that hear the word within the house. For the word may be preached in the world out of the Church, as well as in it: though I easily grant it, that such as hearing the word do yeeld professed subjection to it, are vessels within the Church, howsoever some of them may be vessels of dishonour, as well as others of honour.

His 3d: Reason taken from Mr. Ainsworths Concession, will reach no further then the former.

The Saints (saith he) by calling are the onely matter of a visible Church: yet withall we hold, that many are called, but few chosen. So also the kingdom of heaven is a draw-net, wherein are good and bad fishes: a barn-store, wherein are good wheat and chaffe.

All this we willingly grant. But it was never Mr. Ainsworths meaning, that all who are called to be Saints (in Mr. Rutterfords sense) are true matter of a visible Church; to wit, when they are onely called or exhorted to be Saints, by the externall voice of the ministry of man, without any inward power of the Spirit of God to subdue them so much as to visible profession of Saintship. When men are called to be Saints by the ministry of man, but do abhor and deride the very name and shew of a Saint, it was never his meaning to account or call such, *Saints by calling.*

Yea, but Mr. Ainsworth acknowledgeth, many are called, but few chosen; and we say as much, and the place alledged saith as much expressly, Matth. 20. 16. But those that were so called, were not onely called by the externall voice of man; but by so much efficacy of the Spirit, that they all came into the vineyard, and became labourers in the vineyard, though not all, with integrity of

of heart. I would have no man here mistaken by an equivocation of externall calling. For an externall calling as it is distinguished from effectually, may be put for such a calling by the voice of Gods Ministers as either obtaineth no Answer at all (not so much as conviction in judgement, nor any outward reformation of life, like that of the *Athenians*, *Act.* 17. 18.) or reacheth to conviction of judgement, and some stirrage of affections, and some outward reformation of life, as that of *Simon Magus*. Now all such as in Scripture phrase are termed *Saints* by calling, received a stronger calling then the former sort of these. They were either effectually called to sanctification in Christ Jesus, or, at least were wrought upon to the conviction of their judgements, and to the subduing of their outward conversation to the profession of holinesse. Never doth the Scripture call them *Saints* by calling, who were onely called by the externall voice of man, but were never subdued to the acknowledgement, and profession of the Gospel of Christ.

Mr. Rutherford his 2d: Conclusion tending to clear the state of the Question, is this;

All the members of the visible Church, de jure, by right, or by morall obligation ought to be Saints effectually called.

Herein we fully consent with him; as hath been said above in the 2d: and 3d: Position.

His 3d: Conclusion is:

But, de facto, as the visible Church is in the field of the world, all the members of the visible Church are not effectually called, justified, sanctified. Neither is it needfull by a physcally obligation, for the true nature and essence of a visible Church, that all the members of it be inwardly called and sanctified. Every professor is obliged to beleive; else the wrath of God abideth on him, and he is condemned already. But to make a man a visible professor, and so a member of the true visible Church as visible, saving faith is not essentially required, so as he should be no member of the Church visible, if he beleive not.

That this may be rightly taken, observe (saith he) that the visible Church falleth under a twofold consideration. 1. In concreto, as a Church; 2. in abstracto, as visible. The visible Church considered in concreto, is a part of the universall, Catholick invisible Church: in which consideration we deny (saith he) reprobates and unbelievers to be members of the visible Church.

[And

[And he giveth five Reasons for it.]

But if the Church be considered in abstracto, under the notion of visibility as visible, and performing all the externall acts of professing, preaching, hearing, governing, &c. All the externall professors, who are not manifestly and openly scandalous, are to be reputed members of the true visible Church.

This his 3d: Conclusion I consent unto: though this Distinction, which he bringeth for the clearing of it, I should have understood it better, if he had applyed the termes contrariwise; to wit, that the Church considered in abstracto, as it is in its own nature, by Christs institution, so onely the regenerate profess beleevers, are the members of it; But considered in concreto, as it is existent in its visible subjects, so reprobates, and unregenerate Christians, yet professing the faith: they may be the members of it. As in like case, it is said of faith; considered in abstracto, in its own nature, it is free from doubting: for doubting is not of the nature of faith, but contrary to it. But consider faith in concreto, as it is found in this or that subject (according to the common condition of regenerate men) so it is ever mixed with some doubting, more or lesse. But so long as we agree in the point, we will not vary about words.

But the Conclusions, which he inferreth from this Distinction, call for a word or two of revisall.

1. Saith he, *Separatists arguments must be weak: for they all conclude that which we deny not, and no other thing, to wit, that hereticks, adulterers, sorcerers, blasphemers, be no parts of the visible Church, as it is a Church.*

But (by his leave) their Arguments prove two things more:

1. That such scandalous persons ought not to be admitted into the visible Church: 2. That being in the visible Church, they ought to be cast out by just censure. Nor are their Arguments to prove these argued of weaknes, by that distinction, from whence this conclusion is inferred.

It is true, when they argue, that such a Church ceaseth to be a Church, where such are tolerated, there indeed the weaknesse of their Arguments bewrayeth it self. But yet it may be doubted, whether Mr. Rutherford himself do not seem to favour this arguing of theirs, when in the next page (pag: 97.) he resolveth, That

Of the Holinesse of Church-members.

in the visible Church considered under the notion of visibility, all externall professors, who are not manifestly and openly scandalous, are to be reputed Members of the true visible Church.

Which if it be so, do not then the Arguments of the Separatists conclude, that hereticks, adulterers, forcerers, blasphemers, are no parts of Christs visible Church, not onely as it is a Church, but also as it is visible? For if all externall professors, who are not manifestly and openly scandalous are to be reputed members of the true visible Church, considered under the notion of visibility; then surely hereticks, adulterers, forcerers, and blasphemers (who are manifestly and openly scandalous) they are no parts of the visible Church, no not as visible.

His 2d: Conclusion inferred from the former Distinction, is, That preaching of the Gospel is a note of the Church: and profession of faith is a note of the Church: the former of *Ecclesia docens*, the other of *Ecclesia utens*.

I have sometimes met with such a distinction of *Dialectica*: that it is either *docens*, or *utens*: nor do I refuse the application of it to *Ecclesia*. Neither would I deny, the preaching of the Gospel to be a note of the Church, if the profession of faith according to the Gospel be joyned with it. Otherwise the Ministry teaching of the Gospel, though it be *docens*, yet it is not *Ecclesia docens*, unlesse the auditory do professe the Gospel, and so be *utens*, and not *abutens* of what is taught.

His 3d: Conclusion inferred from the Distinction above, touching profession, I would not wave it: let it stand; I affect not distance, but consent, so far as may be, without prejudice to the truth. But when from these premises, he cometh to draw up the state of the Question, I cannot so freely and fully close with him there.

The Question then is, (saith he) whether visible Saints, 1. forsaking all known sins: 2. doing all the known will of God: 3. growing in grace, be the onely true matter of a right and lawfull consistent visible Church and Congregation: so that we are to joyn with no company of the worshippers of God, but such visible Saints as these: And to acknowledge no other society for a true Church, whereto we are obliged to joyn our selves, as members, save onely such a society?

Or is this sufficient for the nature and right constitution of a true visible Church,

Church, that the company we are to joine our selves unto, as visible members, have in it these true marks of a visible Church; The pure word of God purely preached; the Sacraments duely administred, with discipline according to Gods word; and withall, a people externally professing the foresaid faith: Suppose they cannot give to us manifest tokens and evidences, that they are effectually called, and partakers of the Divine Nature, translated from death to life, elected, called, and justified? This latter (saith he) we hold as the truth of God: those of the Separation, hold the former.

But if those of the Separation hold the former, we (here) do not hold with them, but professe our Dissent from them, as appeareth in the 5, 6, 7. Positions, layed down above, in the beginning of this Chapter.

And for the latter, which he saith, he (with the rest) do hold as the truth of God, we had need to understand him a little more clearly, before we can declare either our assent, or dissent. For he may take those Marks either joyntly, or severally: if joyntly, we consent with him, *There is the true nature of a visible Church, where the pure word of God is purely preached, and the Sacraments duely administred, with discipline also according to the word of God.* But then his words must be rightly understood, as they properly mean. For we conceive the Sacraments are not duely administred, if they be administred to undue persons, to such as are ignorant and scandalous. Nor is Discipline administred according to the word of God, if ignorant and scandalous persons be admitted into the Church.

Neverthelesse, we should not deny, that though all these marks should not concur joyntly; yet the nature of a true Church may be found, though defective for integrity. As (put case) if discipline be not duely administred, nor the Sacraments according to the word of God, as it was in *Corinth* when the incestuous person, and many other abuses both in discipline, and in the Lords Supper were tolerated: yet the nature and essence of a true Church was preserved amongst them.

But if he intend these Marks to be taken severally, then the preaching of the word alone, without some professed subjection to it, will not be a mark of a true Church. The preaching of the pure word of God purely, (as by *Paul* at *Athens*, *Act. 17.*) was no certain mark of a pure Church there: unlesse the Athenians had

had yeelded professed subjection to it. Nor would the circumcision of the Schemites, argue a true Church amongst them; much lesse Discipline, without professed subjection of the people to the word, in a way of God. Neither will it much mend the matter to say, (with Mr. Rutherford) *That it is not the preaching of the word occasionally, that is a property or mark of a true Church: but the constant preaching of it.* For amongst us the pure word of God is preached purely, and weekly to the Indians, to two Congregations by turns, and they resort constantly to the hearing of it: And haply means may be procured for the continuance of it (as hath been honorably begun by the Lady Armin, and others:) and yet that will not constitute a Church of *Indians*, without some more professed subjection to it, then constant attendance upon the hearing of it will reach unto. Howbeit now (through mercy) sundrie of them yeeld subjection.

And for Discipline, though it were (as sometime it hath been) strictly administred in a cloyster of *Monks*, no open scandalous vice tolerated amongst them: yea though they should enjoy both the Sacraments in both kinds, administred amongst them (as by speciall dispensation might have been allowed to them, as was to the *Bohemians*;) yet without the preaching of the pure word of God, (yea, and some professed subjection to it) that would not constitute them a true Church of God.

For better clearing the state of the Question, Mr. Rutherford propoundeth, and assoyleth some Questions. *There be* (saith he) *many questions infolded here of divers natures: For,*

1. *The Question is, if a society have the word, and seals, and right discipline, and they professe the truth, but suppose their lives be wicked, whether should they not be answerable to that which they professe?*

I answer: (saith he) No doubt, they ought to be answerable to their Light, and obey the holy calling.

Well, and good: herein we freely consent with him.

2. *What if many of them lead a life contrary to what they do professe, and yet the Governors use not the rod of Discipline to censure them, then whether should the members separate from that Church?*

They ought to separate (say the Separatists:) *They ought not to separate from the Church, and worship, say we. They are to stay with their Mother, but modestly to plead with her, and to say to Archippus, &c. And*

we say so too. But what if the Church, and the Rulers thereof will not hear us? We say then, it were requisite to inform other neighbour Churches what is scandalous amongst us, and to sollicite them to joyne with us in seeking the conviction, and reformation of our Church. But what if such help cannot be had: or being had, do not prevail? may not a man in such a case for the comfort of his own Soul, and in way of witnesse-bearing against such enormities, peaceably withdraw himself from them, and ioine to another more pure congregation? We know no cause to doubt of it. *Jeremiab* (though a Prophet) withdrew himself from Jerusalem, *Jer. 37. 12.* And *Calvine* giveth the Reason, *Tadebat enim ipsum urbis, quia videbat se frustra operam consumere. Tadio itaque confectus, quia videbat se nihil consequi apud homines du-ros & refractarios, hinc factum est ut cuperet se subtrahere à conspectu totius populi.* And this exposition is futable to *Jeremies* own expression of his own desire (*Chap. 9. 2.*) *O (saith he) that I had in the wilderness a lodging place of wayfaring men, that I might leave my people, and go from them: for they be all adulterers, an assembly of treacherous men.*

3. His 3d: Question, which he assoyleth for clearing the point, is, *What if there be purity of doctrine, but extreame wickednesse contrary to their doctrine, whether is that company a true Church or not?*

I answer, (saith he) it is a true visible, and a teaching, or right ministeriall Church, but (so farre as can be seen) not an holy, nor a sanctified Church, and therefore must not be deserted, and left.

But purity of doctrine, though it may be a good testimony of a pure Ministry, and denominate it to be a true, visible, teaching, right Ministry: yet it will not argue the company, where pure doctrine is taught, to be a true visible teaching, right, ministeriall Church, in case the whole body of the people do live in extreme wickednesse contrary to their doctrine. Indeed if the doctrine be pure, and but a few names in the Church yeeld professed subjection to it, I should grant that Church might be accounted a true visible Church, in regard of the better part of it, as it was with *Sardis*, *Rev. 3. 1. to 4.* But if the whole society should live in extreme wickednesse contrary to their doctrine, and yet be a Church, then a company might be a Church only for their hearing sake, though they heard with scorn and blasphemy. If such a company be

Ecclesia,

Ecclesia, it is doubtlesse *Ecclesia malignantium*: and to withdraw from such a Church after due admonition, and conviction, is no schisme. *Psal.* 26. 5. and 55. 6. to 11.

4. Q. *What if the guides of the Church receive in for members of the Church, those that are known to be most scandalous, and wicked, and not such Saints, as Paul writeth unto, at Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Colosse?*

The answer is, the faults of the Guides are not your faults, who are private members. You are to keep publick communion in the publick ordinances of Christ, but not to partake with their unfruitfull workes of darkness, but to reprove them rather.

But if private members be perswaded in conscience from the word of God, that themselves have due right, and interest, as well in the admission of members, as in excommunication of offenders, or in election of officers, how shall they keep themselves from partaking in the sins of their officers, if they suffer them to go on in such a manifest breach of rule, without due proceeding against them for their reformation?

Not that I would encourage them to proceed against their officers without consulting with other Churches, (officers, and brethren) and without due time allowed, and due means used, for their reformation. But if no means prevail, what hindreth, but that the body of private brethren (that is, the Church without officers, who indeed are not private, but a publick Society) may withdraw from the communion of such officers: (*Rom.* 16. 17: and from ministering to them, as well as before they admitted them to communion, and elected them to ministration? It is essentiall to community, to have power to admit unto communion and to withdraw from communion.

5. Q. *What if the members of the Church can give no reall proofes that they are inwardly called, sanctified, and justified, and yet no scandalous out-breakings to be seen in them to testifie the contrary?*

I answer, (saith he) forasmuch as grace may be under many ashes, (as a piece of gold under mountains of earth) if they professe the sound faith, they are a true visible Church, and we are to acknowledge them as such, and to ioine our selves as members to such a society: or being members already, we are to remain in that society, and not to separate from it in any sort.

But I marvell here, why he putteth in this favourable answer with two such cautions, or conditions, which if they were both wanting

wanting, his Answer would still be the same. The two cautions be, 1. No scandalous out-breakings to be seen amongst them: 2. If they professe the sound faith.

Now what if they professe, and protest against the sound faith delivered by their Ministers? And what if they do break out into notorious scandals, living in extreme wickednesse? as he said before in Q. 3. Notwithstanding the absence of both these conditions here required, and the putting of the contrary, yet the congregation was still to be accounted, *a true, visible, teaching, right ministeriall Church, and therefore must not be deserted, and left.* See his Answer to Q. 3. So whether the body of the brethren (which is the Church) professe the true faith, or professe it not, whether out breakings into open scandals be found amongst them, or not: yet still we must give to such Churches the right hand of Fellowship, and not desert them.

But for our parts, we should not dissent, that such a Congregation may be a true visible Church of God, where those two conditions are found: And withall, that there may be a lawfull remaining in such a Church. Neverthelesse, we beleeve also there may be a lawfull departure from it, without sinfull separation: in case we neither renounce their Church-estate, nor brotherly communion with them, when we shall have occasion to come amongst them. If a man may remove from one Church to another for the greater expediency of his outward calling: why not much rather for the greater expediency of his spirituall edification? But in this I suppose there will be no dissent.

His 4th. Conclusion is occasioned by Mr. Ainsworths complaint, that swarms of Atheists, Idolaters, Papists, and Erronious Sectaries, Witches, Theeves, Adulterers, lyars, &c. are found in the Churches from which they separate. Whereupon he holdeth out this for a

4th. Conclusion, *That howsoever openly and grossly prophane wicked persons (as known Atheists, and mockers of Religion, Idolaters, Papists, Hereticks, witches, theeves, adulterers) are not to be received into the Church, as members thereof, untill they give evidence of their repentance: nor to be kept in the Church, but to be excommunicated: yet there is nothing more required, as touching the essentiall properties, and nature of being members of a Church, as visible, but that they professe before men, the*
faith,

faith, and desire the seals of the Covenant, and crave fellowship with the visible Church.

In this Conclusion of his, there be three distinct Propositions included: whereof the two first tend much towards reconciliation: the third will need some explication, and in some sence, after a sort may be admitted.

The 1. Proposition included in this his 4th. Conclusion, is, *That notorious scandalous persons are not to be received into the Church, as members thereof, untill they give evidence of their repentance.*

2. *That such like notorious offenders are not to be kept in the Church, but to be excommunicated.*

Both these we embrace with him, as the holy truths of God.

3. *That neverthelesse, There is nothing more required to the essence, and nature, and being of the members, of a Church, as visible, but that they professe before men the faith, and desire the seals of the Covenant, and crave fellowship with the visible Church.*

But this 3d. Proposition, as it is propounded in way of an Argument *a diversis* doth imply, that both the divers parts might be found in one and the same subject, that some persons may be notorious offenders (as known Atheists, mockers of Religion, Idolaters, Papists, Hereticks, witches,) and yet professe before men the faith.

But this seemeth to me to imply a contradiction. For Atheists, mockers of Religion, and witches do not professe the faith, but renounce it. Idolaters, Papists, and Hereticks do not professe the true faith, but subvert the foundations of it.

Neverthelesse I deny not, but that in some sence, any such notorious offender may have the essence and being of a member of the Church, as visible, to wit, in this sence, a corrupt and rotten member, fit to be cut off. A member of the visible Church (though formerly an inoffensive professor of the faith,) may afterwards fall away into any of these notorious scandals, and yet for a while stil retain the essence and being of a member of the Church as visible, to wit, till the Church have orderly proceeded against him; otherwise the Church should want power to proceed to the excommunication of such a notorious delinquent. For what hath the Church to do, to judge men without? 1 Cor. 5. 12. But such within the Church are to be cast out: 1 Cor. 5. 11. And if

such

Such were tolerated in a Church; a Christian man should have little comfort to joyn in fellowship with such a Church, or to continue long in it, if joyned.

For take this 4th. Conclusion (as it is here expressed by the Author, and to his intent) and apply it to a civill Society, and see if it be not deceitfull and dangerous: though I believe he himself neither intend deceit, nor danger to the Church in it. Howsoever rebels and traitors, robbers and murderers, are not to be received into the civill society of the common-wealth, untill they give in security of their good behaviour: nor to be tolerated in the common-wealth, but to be cut off, and executed: yet there is nothing more required, as touching the essentiall properties or nature of being members of a common-wealth, but that they be born and live in it, that they professe subjection to the laws and government before men, and desire the liberties of subjects, and crave fellowship with the common-wealth. And therefore a Countrey consisting of such is a true visible common-wealth, and a man coming amongst them, ought to joyne with them; and being of them, ought not to separate from them.

But who seeth not, there is a broad difference between these two, what is essentially required, to make men members of a society (fit and ripe to be cut off:) and what is necessarily required to make men such members of a society, whereunto a man ought to joyne himself, and unto whom, being joyned he ought not to separate himself from them?

SECT. III.

Rebearing and avoiding Mr. Rutherfords Arguments for his

4th. Conclusion.

But as if this 4th. Conclusion (such as it is) were the very staffe and state of the controversie, Mr. Rutherford proveth it by six Arguments:

1. *From the manner of receiving members in the Apostolick Church, where Ananias, and Saphira (hipocrites) and Simon Magus (not long before a sorcerer) were received into the Church.*

2. *From the estate of the visible Church planted and constituted lawfully, which is as a Draw-net, (wherein are fishes of all sorts:) or as an*
house

house wherein are all sorts of vessels, precious and base, or as a Barn-store, wherein is wheat, and chaffe.

3. From the right constitution of such a true Church, where the man without the wedding garment came in to the marriage of the Kings son, Matth. 22.

4. From the right constitution of the Church of Israel, who were Gods holy and chosen people, and yet because of back-sliders and revolvers amongst them, a perverse and crooked generation, an whorish people, an harlot city, full of murderers.

5. From the right constitution of the Church of the Jews, which was the Lords vineyard, and building, of whom was salvation, who had Moses his chair amongst them, &c. and yet were blinde guides, persecuted Christ, killed the Prophets, &c.

6. From the right constitution of the Churches planted by the Apostles, as that of Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus, Thyatira, Sardis, Laodicea: where many wicked persons were found, as Demas, Hymeneus, &c.

Ans But all these Arguments do prove no more, then what we willingly grant, namely, these two things:

1. That hypocrites, and false brethren may creep into the Church, yea into the purest Churches.

2. That such hypocrites, and false brethren may afterwards break forth into open notorious scandals, yea and may (at least for a time) be tolerated in them, and yet not take away the nature and essence of a true visible Church.

Of these things there is no controversie. But none of all these Arguments do prove any one of these three things:

1. That these Churches did receive any open scandalous persons into their communion without profession of their repentance: or that they did tolerate them in the Church with Gods allowance. It is true, Philip received Simon Magus who had been a great forcerer: but did not Simon renounce his divellish art and profession, before he was baptized; as well as those of like profession? *Act. 19. 18, 19, 20.*

2. These Arguments do not prove, that a Christian man was bound in conscience to joyn himself unto such a Church, where such notorious scandals were tolerated, in case he had opportunity and liberty to joyn himself to some other Church, who walked more faithfully according to the order of the Gospel.

It is true indeed, whilst the Church of Israel, or of the Jews

stood in fellowship of covenant with God, there was no other Church under heaven, to which a faithfull profelyte might joyne. For Israel was not onely Gods people, but his peculiar people by covenant: and therefore untill they renounced the covenant, and Christ the surety of the covenant, God could not take any other into Church-fellowship with him: and so all religious profelytes must joyne to them, or live out of Church-fellowship. But the case is not so now: now, no one Gentile-church is a peculiar people to God; other Gentile churches are Gods people, as well as they. If a Christian man see swarms of Atheists, and Epicures, Idolaters, and adulterers tolerated in one Church, he may lawfully forbear his joyning with them, and joyne to another more pure.

3. Neither do those Arguments prove, that a member of such a Church, where such notorious scandals are tolerated, may not after all good means of reformation used in vain, withdraw himself from such a Church, and ioyne to another more purely administred, if such another may be found, and fellowship with it orderly obtained. When the golden calves were erected in Israel, and the true Priests were cast out of their office, the godly Priests left their possessions, and employments in the synagogues, and went up to Jerusalem; and such as set their hearts to seek the Lord, came up after them out of all the tribes of Israel, unto Jerusalem to worship the Lord God of their fathers. 2 Chron. 11. 13, 14, 15, 16. And may not Christians now go and do likewise, in the like case?

SECT. V.

Declaring the state of the Question according to our apprehension.

When I seek the true state of the Question in our brethren of the Presbyteriall way, I do not satisfie my self in the clear apprehension of their judgments. For when they speak, what ought to be (*de jure*) the qualification of Church-members, they speak safely and holily, that the members of the Church ought to be *Saints by calling*, yea and sincerely also to answer their calling.

But when they speak *de facto*, what members are found to be even in the purest Churches, they say, they are often found to be hypocrites,

hipocrites, and some notoriously scandalous, both in judgement and practise: and yet the essence of a true Church preserved.

Neither do we dissent from them in both these Propositions, although they are pleased to dispute against us in defence of this latter, which we never denied.

Nor would I father, or fasten any tenents upon them, which themselves might not own. I shall therefore content my self, to declare our own judgement about this point, in 2. Propositions: wherein also if they concur with us, we are then agreed in that which Mr. Baily counteth the weightiest point of difference between us, and shall blesse the Lord for such harmony. But if they dissent in either, then thereby is the pinch of the state of the Question.

1. The first Proposition is this; Such persons, and such onely, are lawfully received as members into the fellowship of the visible Church, who do before the Lord, and his people, professe their repentance, and faith in Christ, and subjection to him in his ordinances: and do not scandalize their profession, with an unchristian conversation.

2. The 2d. Proposition is this; That such as are born, and baptized members of the Church, are not orderly continued, and confirmed members of the Church, unless when they grow up to yeers, they do before the Lord and his people, professe their repentance, and faith in Christ Jesus, and subjection to him in his ordinances: and do not scandalize their profession with an unchristian conversation.

When I say they may not be confirmed, I mean they may not be admitted to the seal of the Lords Supper, (which is a Sacrament of confirmation) and so are not to be admitted to all other rights of a Church-member, as the election of officers, admission of members, censure of offenders.

From both these Propositions, three others follow as necessary consequences.

1. That ignorant persons (grossly ignorant) of the first principles, and foundations of Religion, are not to be received members into the Church: or if born in the Church, yet so continuing in ignorance to their ripe age, they are not to be confirmed members.

For such cannot make profession of their faith, which they

know not. Hence *Paul* counted it a shame to the Church of *Corinth*, that some of their members had not the knowledge of God, *1 Cor. 15. 34.*

2. Atheists, Witches, Papists, and all Hereticks, who either deny the faith, or professe a false faith against the foundation of Christian Religion, they are not to be received members into the fellowship of the Church, without repentance and reformation.

For such professe not the faith of Christ, but either no faith, or a false faith.

3. Persons notoriously scandalous for any grosse crime (as Idolatry, adultery, fornication, drunkenness, oppression, perjury, prophane, lying,) are not to be received into the Church, nor continued in it.

For such though they professe the faith of Christ, and subjection to him: yet in their works, they deny him, and scandalize their profession with an unchristian conversation. And therefore much lesse are they to be compelled by any Ecclesiasticall or Civill censures either to joine themselves to the Church, or to continue in the Church, or to be confirmed in Church-estate, by partaking in the communion of the Lords Supper.

CHAP. II.

Propounding the Reasons and Grounds of our judgement and practise.

SECT. I.

Our first reason may be given from the pattern of the Church of the old Testament. The Church of Israel was at first planted visibly and eminently in *Abrahams* family: he and his seed being received into covenant with God, and called to the fellowship of the seal thereof, in circumcision. But when *Ishmael*, though a member of this Church, and circumcised, grew up to a prophane mocking of the seed of the promise (in mocking *Isaac*) he was cast out of the Church, as unworthy to continue in that holy fellowship. *Gen. 21. 9, 10.*

The like might justly have been the censure of *Esaú* for his profane, and fornication. *Hebr. 12. 16.* And therefore though

though his father was indulgent to him: yet Gods hand cut him off from the inheritance both of the birth-right, and of the blessing, *Hebr. 12. 16, 17.* Whence it was that himself was deprived of Church-fellowship, and his posterity deprived both of Church-fellowship, and of the seal of the Covenant, and blessing, which was circumcision. And so *Jeremiah* reckoeth up *Edom* amongst the nations uncircumcised. *Jer. 9. 26.*

In *Jacobs* family, although his blessing reached beyond the blessing of his ancestors, (*Gen. 49. 26.*) to all his Children, so as that they and their posterity were all of them admitted into the fellowship of the Church: and though they had expiatory sacrifices amongst them even for known scandalous offences, which being offered might keep sundry of them in the Church, who otherwise might justly deserve cutting off from the congregation: yet even in the Church of *Israel*, there was order taken for the excommunication of scandalous offenders, as is proved at large by a judicious and learned Minister of *Edinburgh*, *Mr. Gillespi*, in *Aarons Rod Blossoming*, book 1. *Ca. 6. & ca. 12.* Whatsoever therefore is alledged from the pattern of the Church of *Israel*, for the lawfull constitution of a Church, where many notorious scandalous persons are found, it onely argueth the sinfull neglect of Church-discipline in the toleration of such publick scandals in the Church: and it may also argue the continuance of their Church-estate notwithstanding such toleration; but it doth not argue the lawfull constitution of the Church of such persons, nor the lawfull toleration of such offenders in it.

Besides, that such as were members of the Church of *Israel* (even born members) were to professe their faith and obedience before the Lord, and his people, may appear from the orden of confession appointed by God himself, *Deut. 26.* throughout, where every *Israelite* when he brought his first-fruits and tithes, he was to make confession before the Lord, and the Priest, at the tabernacle of the Congregation, of the lowe and perishing estate of his father *Jacob*, of their affliction in *Egypt*, of their redemption out of it by the mighty hand of God, and of the faithfulness and goodnesse of God in giving them that land; And withall, they were to make profession of their obedience to the Commandments of God, (*v. 14.*) and in thus doing, they professed,

and

and avouched the Lord to be their God: and the Lord avouched them to be his people, *v. 17, 18.*

And that the like or greater care was had of the profession and conversation of such profelytes, as were admitted into the Church of Israel, I will not go about to shew out of the Jewish writers; the Jewish writers were not eye-witnesses thereof, as living after those times. But the Prophecies of *Isaiah* may abundantly suffice to shew, what manner of persons were rightly accepted to be profelytes both in the old and new Testament; such they were, as joyned themselves to the Lord, to serve him, to love his Name, to be his servants, keeping his Sabbaths, and taking hold of his Covenant. *Isa. 56. 6, 7.*

SECT. II.

ARGUMENT II.

2. A 2d: Argument tending to clear what manner of persons are to be received members of the Church, may be taken from *Johns Baptisme*; for he received none to his Baptisme, but such as confessed their sins, and therewith professed their repentance, and faith in Christ, who was to come after him, whence also his Baptisme was called, *The baptisme of repentance, for the remission of sins. Matth. 3. 6. Act. 19. 4. Luk. 3. 3.* Whence the Argument ariseth thus.

Such whom a Gospel-ministry would refuse, and withhold from Baptisme, such ought not to be received into Church-fellowship.

But the ministry of the Gospel would refuse, and withhold scandalous persons from Baptisme, and receive none but such as professed faith and repentance.

Therefore scandalous persons, are not to be received to Church-fellowship, but such as professe faith and repentance.

The former Proposition (the major) is granted on all hands. For such as may not partake in any seal of Church-fellowship, may not partake in Church-fellowship. The latter is proved by the instance of *John Baptist*, who baptized all that came to him, confessing their sins, and professing repentance, whether Publicanes, souldiers, or other people. But when he saw many of the Pharisees,

Pharisees and Sadduces come to his Baptisme, he refused them with a sharp reproof, *O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to fly from the wrath to come?* Match. 3. 7.

Obj. But John did receive these Pharisees and Sadduces to his Baptisme, though he did intertain them with such a sharp r. proof.

Ans: It seemeth to me incredible, contradictory to the very stile of Johns baptisme, that he should administer the baptisme of repentance, and yet baptise impenitent persons, a generation of vipers; unlesse baptisme were given not to seale up our initiation into Christ, but to beget it, which orthodox Divinity doth reject, it is not credible that John would cast holy things to dogs, or pearls to swine: or that he would make the Temple of God, a den not onely of theives, but (which is worse) of vipers. It is farre more credible, that the speech of the Evangelist (*Luk. 7. 29. 30.*) reached to these Pharisees as well as others, that all the people and the Publicanes, who heard John, justified God, being baptized with the baptisme of John: but the Pharisees and Lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, and were not baptized of him. Holy *Augustine* is most clear in this point, that neither John Baptist admitted any open scandalous persons to his baptisme, nor that in the Church of Christ any should be received unto baptisme who live in any sinfull course, till they professe repentance and reformation. And for that purpose wrote a whole book, entituled, *De Fide & operibus*, extant in his 4th. Tome.

SECT. III.

ARGUMENT III.

3. A 3d. Argument (or rather, a 3d. head of Arguments) may be taken from the estate and condition of the members of the Apostolick Churches, which because they are expressed more at large in the way of the Churches (*Chap. 3. Sect. 3.*) I shall here briefly rehearse them, and clear them from such exceptions, as have been made against them by our brethren of the Presbyteri-all way.

The 1. Reason there, was taken from the neere relation, between the Church, and the Lord Jesus, with the other persons in the Trinity. The Lord Jesus is the head of the Church, even of the visible Church: and the visible

visible Church is the body of Christ Jesus. 1 Cor. 12. 27. The visible Church is said to be the habitation of God by the Spirit. Ephes. 2. 22. To be the temple of the holy Ghost, and the Spirit of God to dwell in them: 1 Cor. 3. 16; 17. To be espoused to Christ, as a chaste virgin, 2 Cor. 11. 2. The members of the visible Church are said to be sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty: 2 Cor. 6. 18. and are exhorted to be followers of God, as dear children: Ephes. 5. 1. Now how can the visible Church be called the members of the body of Christ, or the spouse of Christ, or the temples of the holy Ghost, or the sons and daughters of the heavenly Father, except the members in charitable discretion be (as indeed the holy Ghost describeth them to be) Saints by calling? 1 Cor. 1. 2. and faithfull brethren, Colos. 1. 2. and that not onely by externall profession (for these are too high styles for hypocrites) but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

This Reason cast into form runneth thus; if particular (or visible) Churches stand in so neer relation unto Christ, as members to their head, spouses to their husband; unto the holy Ghost as his temples: to the Father, as his sons and daughters: then we cannot lawfully receive any members into the Church, but such as in charitable discretion may be esteemed Saints by calling, and faithfull brethren.

But the former is true: therefore the latter. The connexion of the major Proposition Mr. Rutherford would grant, if Christ were the head of the visible Church as visible. And so I intend it, that Christ is the head of the Church, not onely as invisible, but visible also. But this he denieth; For, saith he, *that Christ is the head of the visible Church, as visible, is not in all the word of God.*

I would not here strain at words. There may be a fallacy, in affirming Christ to be head of the visible Church, as visible. For then it would follow, that he is not onely the head of every visible Church, (which may well passe:) but also that he is the head onely of the visible Church, and so not of the invisible. But that is far from my meaning: and I hope, far from his intention, to fasten it upon us. But this I say, that Christ is the head of the Church, as the Church, whether it be considered as invisible, or visible. For even the Church considered as visible is the kingdom of Christ; for so the Church is called the kingdom of heaven, when it is compared to a field, wherein are tares, and wheat, to a draw-net, wherein are good fish, and bad: virgins wife and foolish,

foolish, servants profitable and slothfull: *Matth. 13. 24. and 47. and 25. 1, 2, 14.* And who is the head and King of this Kingdom, but Christ? The Laws of this Kingdom, are his statutes: the officers of this Kingdome are his servants: the people of this kingdome, are his subjects by professed subjection: the ordinances administred in this kingdome are his Institutions: the censures are the judgements of his mouth, which maketh me to marvell, how Mr. *Rutherford* could allow himself liberty to deny Christ to be head of the Church, as visible, and that his headship thereto is not in all the word of God. But therefore in a few words after he qualifyeth his speech; In a large sence (saith he) Christ may be called the head of the Church visible, as visible in regard of the influence of common graces for the ministry, government, and use of the keyes.

But this maketh me still the more to marvell, that so judicious and learned a man should advisedly and deliberately, make Christ the head of the visible Church (as visible) onely in regard of the influence of common graces. For are there not in the visible Church, as visible, as well visible Saints, as visible Hypocrites? And is Christ an head in the visible Church to visible Saints, onely in regard of the influence of common graces? Where then must they seek the influence of Christ in saving graces, if not in the visible Ministry, and keyes of the Church? Is not this to evacuate the saving benefit of living in visible Church-fellowship under visible Ministry, visible Sacraments, and censures? Where did all the Saints of God receive their saving graces of conversion, faith, repentance, sanctification, but in attendance upon Christ the head, in the visible use of visible Church-ordinances? Is not this to send the Saints of God to visible Churches onely for influence of common graces: but for saving grace, they must resort to deserts, and secret chambers? *Matth. 24. 26.* I beleve the pious heart of Mr. *Rutherford* abhorreth such horrid, and enthusiastickall inferences. But let him therefore disclaim such Anti-evangelicall Positions, on which these inferences (for ought I see) do unavoidably follow. No marvell, if deluded Sectaries sleight ordained Ministers, and all publick-visible Church-ordinances, when no greater benefit can be expected from them, (in the judgements of the greatest Divines of this Age) but the influence of common graces.

But from hence, that Christ is the head of the Church visible as visible, in respect of the influence of common graces; it followeth (saith he) that

to be admitted members of the Church under Christ the head, there is not required an union with Christ the head, according to the influence of the life of Christ, but onely an union with Christ as head according to the influence of common gifts. In which respect, Christ may be called the head of Judas the traitor, and of some other hipocriticall professors. And also though the promiscuous multitude, that is, a multitude of profane Atheists, and scandalous mockers be not members of Christ, nor are to be acknowledged as his members, but to be excommunicated: yet the promiscuous multitude of professors, whereof there be reprobate and elect, good and bad, are to be received, and acknowledged as members of Christs visible body, whereof he is the head in this latter sence.

Repl: 1. It hath been proved already, that Christ is the head of the visible Church, as visible, not onely according to the influences of common graces, but according to the influence of the life of Christ. And therefore it will unavoidably follow, that howsoever some plea may be made for hipocrites: yet prophane Atheists, and scandalous mockers (and I may adde also, grosse ignorant persons) are not to be received as members of Christs visible body. For they have no spirituall communion with Christ as head, neither according to the influence of saving life, nor according to the influence of common graces. The Argument runneth plain.

They that have no spirituall communion with Christ, they should not be received as members of the Church, whereof Christ is the head.

But prophane Atheists, and scandalous mockers, and grossly ignorant persons have no spiritual communion with Christ (neither according to the influence of saving graces, nor of common gifts:) and therefore such persons as are not to be received members of that body the Church, whereof Christ is the head.

And Mr. Rutherford himself expressly acknowledgeth, that such grossly scandalous persons are to be excommunicated. Whence it will also unavoidably follow, that if they appear to be such before they be received, they ought not to be received. The Argument is plain:

Such as being members ought to be excommunicated, or cast out of Church-communion, they being out of the Church ought not to be received into Church-communion.

But prophane Atheists, and scandalous mockers, being members,

bers, ought to be excommunicate, and cast out of Church-communion.

Therefore they ought not to be received into Church-communion.

Repl: 2. As for hypocrites, the case is otherwise. They may be received members into the Church, not because they have fellowship with Christ the head, onely according to the influence of common gifts: but because having received some spirituall gifts (though common) they are able to professe before men the exercise of saving gifts also, and so cannot easily be discerned from meer hypocrites, but may passe in the judgement of charitable discretion for sincere professors. But if their hypocrisy were openly known, by any such evidence as might convince them to lye in an estate of hypocrisy, then I conceive, they ought not to be received into the Church. The hypocrisy of *Simon* was not at first discerned by *Philip*: and therefore he beleaving (though with a temporary faith) and professing his faith, as did others, he was received, and baptized. But when his hypocrisy was afterwards discerned by *Peter*, to be a reigning sin in him (for he went about to turn grace it self into merchandise,) then *Peter* accursed him from God, and renounced him from just interest in Church-fellowship; *Thy money* (saith he) *perish with thee; thou hast neither part, nor lot in this matter, for thy heart is not right in the sight of God.* *Act. 8. 20, 21.*

And that hypocrites, if they be known to be such, should not be received into the fellowship of the Church, it may appear from hence, that hypocrites are called false brethren, and said to come in privily into the fellowship of the Saints, *Galat. 2. 4.* Whereas if they had lawfull right to enter in, they should not be called false brethren: nor need they to creep in, the gates of the Church would be set wide open to them with one accord. So *Jude* also describeth the like hypocrites, as creeping in unawares, *Jude 4.* Which could not have been said of them, if open access into the Church were granted freely to hypocrites, as well as to others.

Whereupon it was, that in shutting up this Argument, touching the gracious qualifications of Church-members taken from the high stiles given them in regard of their neer relation, to Christ, to the holy Ghost, to the Father, *I said such stiles were too*

high stiles for hypocrites, as being peculiar to Saints and faithfull brethren, not onely in some externall profession, but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

Not but that Saints by externall profession (who often prove no better then hypocrites) may be admitted: nor because hypocrites, when they declare themselves to be hypocrites, do forthwith *ipso facto*, cease to be Church-members: but because *de jure*, all Church-members ought to be Saints, and faithfull brethren: And those that have the keyes of the Church, should not open the doore to any, but such as in charitable discretion, they conceive to be better then hypocrites, even Saints by calling, and faithfull brethren; and yet not with such rigid examination, as to discourage broken-hearted Christians, for as I there said, better 99. hypocrites should perish by presumption, then one humble soul should sink under discouragement, or despair.

If it be said, But why may not hypocrites (even known hypocrites) be received as members into the body of the Church, whereof Christ is the head, seeing they have union with Christ the head, according to the influence of common gifts.

Ans. It is not union with Christ according to the influence of common gifts, that maketh a man fit for the fellowship of the body of Christ in his visible Church. For such members are but dead members: and dead members in the body, like dead branches in the vine, God will cut off, and not engraft, or purge: *Job.* 15. 2. 6. And such as have a name to live, but are dead; Christ will come on them, not as an head to guide them, but as a thief to destroy them: *Rev.* 2. 2, 3. yea and to destroy the Church with them, when they grow numerous. *Isa.* 9. 17.

Hitherto I have onely returned a Reply to Mr. *Rutherford's* first Answer to the Argument taken from the high stiles given to Church-members, in regard of their neer relation to Christ, they being to him, as members to an head; wherein I have been the more large, that I might be the more plain in so weighty a cause; And there be who do tax some of us for reservedness and obscurity, which I therefore do studiously decline.

2. His 2d: Answer is, That our Argument proceedeth upon a false ground, before observed and discovered, that Christ is the head of the Church, the Spouse, Redeemer, and Saviour of the visible Church, as it is visible:

visible: which is the Arminian doctrine of universall grace.

Reply. Where he hath before observed and discovered that false ground, that Christ is the head, and husband of the Church as visible; it hath been there declared, that he is the head and husband of the Church as well visible, as invisible. Visible or invisible is not attended as the formall object of Christs headship, or espousage, or redemption, or salvation. Christ is the Redeemer and Saviour of his elect, whether the fruits of their election be visible or not. And he is the head and Spouse of his Church, and of the true and sincere members of it, though they do make visible profession of their covenant with him, and of their relation to him in the sight of all men.

As for those (whom Mr. Rutherford speaketh of) *prophane Atheists, scandalous mockers, dissembling hypocrites*, we are so far from the Arminian Doctrine to extend universall grace to them, that we would not extend to them the common grace of externall fellowship in the visible Church, if we discerned them evidently to be such.

3. His 3d: Answer to our Argument is this, *If those who are conceived sound beleivers, members of Christ the head, are to be admitted members into the Church, why do you not admit men of such approved piety, as members into your Churches, except they swear to your Church-government, which you cannot make good from the word of God? Now to refuse communion to these, who are known to be members of Christs body, and to separate from them is all one. And therefore in this, you separate your selves from Christs body.*

Reply. Mr. Rutherford is very wrongfully informed, that we refuse communion, or admission of any sound beleever, or member of Christ, or any of approved piety into our Churches, especially upon any such ground, because they will not swear to our Church-government.

For 1. we require no man to swear to our Church-government at all: nor ever did, that I know. Neither do we so much as require, that they should professe their approbation of our Government: but onely, that they professe their subjection to Christs government in his Church, according to the order of the Gospel.

2. We refuse to admit no man of approved piety into the fellowship

fellowship of our Churches, if he be willing to accept it: yea we rather encourage him, and perswade him to it. Onely it is true, we do not compell any man to joyne with us, against his will, as knowing Christ accepteth a willing people, *Psal. 110. 3.* It is not we therefore that separate from such, but they from us.

Whether or no we can make good our Church-government from Gods word, though he be pleased to deny it, and our selves see no cause of presuming on our own strength: Yet we believe on the Lord Iesus Christ (who is the head and King of true Church-government) that himself will bear witness from heaven to that government, which his Gospel hath taught us; and will also in due time give us strength, and opportunity, to make good from his word, what we practise according to it; or else we live not by faith in Church-order, but by fancie. Meanwhile, as we beleeve, we speak, we never yet read, or heard, any such exceptions against our Church-government, as might give us just ground to scruple it.

Mr. Rutherford proceedeth (in pag. 257, 258, 259. of his *Due Right of Presbyteries*) to give some further Answers to other branches of the Argument which we took from the high stile given to Church-members in regard of their neer relation, to Christ, to the holy Ghost, and to the Father, which were all mentioned above, in the propounding of our 3d: Argument; where the visible Church is said to be the habitation of God by the Spirit, *Ephe. 2. 22.* To be the temple of the holy Ghost, and the Spirit of God to dwell in them: *1 Cor. 3. 16, 17.* To be espoused to Christ as a chaste virgin, *2 Cor. 11. 2.* To be the sons and daughters of the Lord God almighty: *2 Cor. 6. 18, &c.* Now how can the visible Church be the habitation of the Spirit, the Spouse of Christ, &c. unless they be in charitable discerning (as indeed the holy Ghost describeth them to be) Saints by calling: *1 Cor. 1. 2.* and faithfull brethren: *Colos. 1. 2.* and that not onely in externall profession (for these are too high stiles for hypocrites,) but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

This Argument we cast into form in the propounding of it above. But Mr. Rutherford here casteth it into another form for us, thus.

Those onely we are to admit members of the visible Church, who in the judgement of charity are conceived to be such, as were the members of the visible Church of Corinth and Ephesus.

But

But onely such as were the habitation of God by his Spirit (not onely in profession, but in some measure of sincerity and truth) were the members of the visible Church of Corinth and Ephesus.

Therefore such onely are we to admit to be members of the visible Church.

This form of Argument is different from what I intended and propounded above, which runs thus:

If particular (or visible) Churches stand in so neer relation to Christ, as members to their head, and spouses to their husband: unto the holy Ghost, as his temples, and habitation: to the Father, as his sons and daughters: then we cannot lawfully receive any members into the Church, but such as in charitable discretion may be esteemed, Saints by calling, and faithfull brethren.

But the former is true: therefore the latter.

But if a categoricall Form may seem more acceptable, take it thus:

Such members, and such onely are we to admit into our Churches, as in charitable discretion we judge suitable to the pattern of the members of Churches planted and acknowledged by the Apostles.

But the members of Churches planted and acknowledged by the Apostles, were such as they in charitable discretion judged to be Saints by calling, faithfull brethren, (and particularly to be the temples of the holy Ghost, the members, and spouses of Christ, the sons and daughters of God Almighty:) Therefore such members, and such onely are we to admit into our Churches, and we do in charitable discretion judge to be Saints, by calling, faithfull brethren, temples of the holy Ghost, &c.

To the Argument Mr. Rusherford returneth foure Answers.

Ans: 1. This Argument (saith he) concludeth not the Question: for it proceedeth onely upon our conception, that we are to admit such members onely of the visible Church, as we judge or conceive to be the spouse of Christ, and truly regenerate.

Now if our conception be erroneous, (as it cannot be infallible) then we may admit those that are not regenerate, if we conceive them to be regenerate.

Very true, we readily grant it.

But then (saith he) our brethren say falsely, that the members admitted
must

must be Saints, and faithfull, not onely in profession, but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

Reply. We say not falsly in either of these: for both are true: the members of the Churches must be Saints, that is, *de jure*, ought to be Saints, not onely in profession, but in some measure of sincerity and truth. Therefore we may not lawfully admit any members into the Church, but such as in charitable discretion we judge to be Saints, and faithfull in some measure of sincerity and truth. It is true, that he saith, the Church may be deceived, and the Apostolick Churches were themselves deceived, yea and the Apostles themselves also in the discerning of the spirituall estate of *Ananias*, and *Saphira*, *Simon Magus*, and such like, at their first admission. Neither doth God require either of the Apostles, or Churches, either then, or now, that we should be able to know the hearts of men (which is Gods own peculiar attribute:) But yet in judgement of charity, they conceived them all to be Saints, and faithfull, whom they admitted, when they did admit them. If those whom they admitted declined afterwards, from their holy profession, and declared themselves by their fruits to be scandalous hypocrites, the Apostles did accordingly proceed against them either by ordinary or extraordinary censures.

2. His 2d. Answer is, the assumption is false, for the Apostles admitted to be members of the Church visible at Corinth, and Ephesus, not onely Saints by true profession, but also carnall men, deniers of the resurrection, partakers of the tables of devils: and in Ephesus, false apostles, and liars: Revel. 2. 3.

Reply. It is true, the Assumption is false, to wit, the Assumption which he miscollected: but not the Assumption which our Argument rightly framed, holdeth forth: which was this, before expressed:

That the members of Churches planted and acknowledged by the Apostles, were such as they in charitable discretion judged to be Saints, and faithfull brethren, (and particularly, the temples of the holy Ghost,) &c.

And for such the Apostle doth expressly acknowledge them: 1 Cor. 1. 2. Ephes. 2. 22.

That some of them fell away afterwards into the deniall of the

he resurrection, or into fellowship of Idolaters, at the Table of Devils, it doth no more argue, that they were such, and so carnall, when they were first admitted into the Church, than it doth argue, that the incontinent *Corinthian* lived in incest with his Mother in Law, when he was first received into the Church: or if he so lived that it was publickly knowne.

It doth not appeare in the Text, that *Paul* admitted into the Church of *Ephesus*, false Apostles and Lyars, the Text alledged, (*Rev. 2. 2, 3.*) saith no such thing: but only, that the Angel (that is, the Eldership) of the Church of *Ephesus*, tryed them, which said they were Apostles, and were not, and found them lyars.

But whether they tryed them before their entrance into the Church, or after, it doth not appeare.

If they tryed them before, and found them Lyars, and so rejected them, it is that which wee readily approve. If after, it must be proved, they were false Apostles in their first entrance, and that *Paul* was more remisse in trying them, and admitting them into their first entrance, than the Elders were, who tryed and discovered them afterwards.

But in case these false Apostles were Members of the Church, when the Elders tryed them, and found them such, (to give the Apostle the honour due to his vigilancie and faithfulness) I dare be bold to say, they did not appeare to the Apostle to bee false Brethren, much lesse false Apostles, when he received them into the Church (if they were received by him at all) but to him they appeared as *Demas* did, when at first he accounted him, his fellow-helper, *Phil. 24.* though afterwards, he proved a desertor, *2 Tim. 4. 10.* Sure I am, *Paul* doth foretell to the Elders of *Ephesus*, that after his departure, grievous wolves should enter in amongst them, not sparing the Flock. Also (saith he) of your owne selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw Disciples after them, *Acts 20. 29, 30.*

If after his departure Wolves entered in amongst them, then he did not himselfe admit them.

And if out of themselves, some were to arise speaking perverse things, then they were not risen amongst them before his departure: at least none were discerned to be so risen.

Obj. But when Paul giveth the Church and Members of Corinth such spirituall Styles, he speaketh of them according to the best part. For the Epistle and Doctrine of the Covenant is written and preached for the Elects sake, and for believers, &c. nor doe the Promises of the Covenant indeed, and in Gods intention belong to the visible Church, though the word be preached to carnall men for their conviction.

Reply. I trust, he will not deny that the word is preached to carnall men for their conversion also, as well as for their conviction: unlesse they be not only carnall, but reprobate. And surely sundry parts of his Epistle are directed to the Instruction and reformation of the partakers at Idols Tables, and of the Denyers of the resurrection: of whom to say, that they were all Reprobates, or carnall men destitute of all Spiritual life, or that the word was written only for their conviction, and not for their unfeigned repentance, it is more then can be justified. Godly men may fall farre and foule, both in judgement and practise. I know no reason, but that the true Saints in Corinth, lately converted from Paganry, might as easily fall to deny the resurrection, as Peter to deny the death & resurrection of Christ Jesus, Mat. 16. 21. 22. Nor doe I see why the like Saints at Corinth, might not as well fall to partake with Idolaters, at the Tables of Devils, as Solomon converse in conjugall communion, with his Idolatrous wives, yea and erect Temples to their Idols and Devils, and to maintaine their Tables at an excessive charge, and yet he still retain his Saint-ship, and they theirs?

3. His third answer is by affirming this Proposition to be false, that only wee are to admit to the visible Church, whom wee conceive to be Saints, and so are perswaded of them in the judgement of Charity.

For the Apostles did admit all Professors, even 3000 at one Sermon in one day, Acts 2. And they could not be perswaded in the judgement of Charity, that they were all Saints.

Reply. If Mr. Rutterford can as well prove that Proposition to be false, as he doth affirm it to be false, we must without tergiversation or evasion, yeild the cause. But the reason he giveth of the falshood of it, is only his bare assertion upon a weak foundation

That the Apostles did admit all Professors, because they admitted even 3000 at one Sermon in one day. Acts. 2. of whom they could not be perswaded in the judgement of charity, that they were all Saints.

Reply.

Reply. 1. If they did admit all Professors, then it doth not appear, that they did admit all opposers, and oppugners, any scandalous, or grossly ignorant persons, nor Atheists, nor any prophane mockers, whose admittance was too far excused above by himself.

Reply. 2. It is too broad an assertion, that the Apostles did admit all Professors, if it be extended to such as professe Christ with their mouthes, but in their workes doe deny him; or if profession be extended to all such, as doe ordinarily heare the word, and crave Fellowship with the Church in the Sacraments. There is no ground of any such latitude of admission in all the New-Testament.

As for those 3000 which the Apostles admitted after one Sermon, in one day: There is no ground of any such latitude of admission in all the New-Testament.

As for those 3000 which the Apostles admitted after our Sermon, in our day: they were not such as only heard that Sermon, but were pricked in their hearts at the hearing of it: and so pricked not as *Stephens* hearers, to kick at it, (*Acts* 7. 54.) but lovingly and reverently to submit themselves to the instruction and direction of them that wounded them, saying to *Peter*, & other the Apostles, Men and Brethren, what shall we do? *Acts* 2. 37. And when they were instructed, and exhorted to repent, and be baptized into the name of Christ, and to save themselves from that froward generation, they gladly received his word, ver. 41. And that in a time, when the receiving of the Word was perillous. And these are said to have continued stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine and Fellowship, ver. 42. to part with their possessions, for the maintenance of the Church ver. 44. 45. and to eate their meat together with gladnesse and singlonesse of heart, ver. 46. yea of the same persons, and of others joyned to them, it is soone after said, they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and were all of one heart, and one Soule, *Acts* 4. 31. 32. These are not the Characters of all Professors, but of Saints: nor can it be argued from the Apostles admission of such, that they admitted all Professors: but such only of whom they were well perswaded in the judgement of charity, that they were all Saints. What though *Ananias* and

Sabbita proved afterwards, not sincere Saints, but Hypocrites? yet there is no colour from the Text, but in judgement of charity, they were conceived to be Saints when they were admitted as well as others. *Julas* a long time was as well thought of, amongst the Disciples, as his fellow-Apostles. *Demas* was as well accounted *Pauls* fellow-labourer, as *Marcus*, or *Aristarchus*, or *Lucas*, *Phil.* 19.

Nor is it any just impeachment of their Saintship, that so many of them (even 3000) were wrought upon in one Sermon, in one day, (as *Mr. Rutenford* intimates) for *Christ* being newly ascended into Heaven, and sitting at the right hand of his Father, it was meet he should put forth more power in his Ordinances, in their first administration, than afterwards.

Kings newly crowned doe *Spargers* *Manna* & *Donaria*, more abundantly, then in the following course of their reigne.

I conceive the words of *David* in *Psalm* 133. doe most fitly and plainly foretell this large increase of the Church, by the first Ministers, when he said, that the Dew (or fruit) of *Christ*s youth, was more than the dew brought forth by the vombe of the morning.

For the place is an evident Prophecie of the power of *Christ* put forth in the Ministry of his word (the Rod of his power) when he sat down first at his Fathers right hand, and brought forth the fruits of his youth, as the Dew of the morning: it had been no great power to breed Hypocrites.

4. His 4th answer taketh exception against the Argument, for saying, that all the visible Church of *Ephesus* (or *Corinth*) was a Spouse betrothed to *Christ*, and Saints by calling, &c. which the word of God saith not: much lesse that they were all such, not only in profession, but also in some measure of sincerity and truth. It is true (saith he) the styles are too high for Hypocrites: but they are not given to the Church precisely, as visible, but as an invisible, and true Church of believers. As when he calleth them Temples of the holy Ghost, Saints by calling, &c. He wrote to the incestuous *Corinth* amongst the rest, whom he commandeth to cast out of the Church.

Reply. 1. The Argument doth not say, that all the visible Church of *Ephesus* or *Corinth* were Spouses to *Christ*, or Saints by calling, or Sonnes to *God Almighty*, not only in profession, but

but in some measure of sincerity and truth : but that the Apostle in the judgement of charity, conceived them to be such : or else he would never have given them such high styles, as are not compatible to Hypocrites. Those (whom he instanteth in) who called themselves Apostles in *Ephesus*, and were found Lyars, (*Rev. 2. 2, 3.*) they did not arrogate any such high place to themselves, when *Paul* wrote his Epistle to the *Ephesians*. Else, the Holy-Ghost would as well have taxed that arrogancie in them by his Pen, as *Christ* did afterwards by the conviction of the Elders of *Ephesus* : yea the very proceeding of the Church of *Ephesus*, against those false Apostles, doth argue the Body of the Church, to be a sincere Spouse of *Christ*, and a Temple of the Holy-Ghost.

Reply 2. There is no crime taxed, by the Apostle, either in the Church of *Ephesus*, or *Corinth*, that doth convince any of the Members of either Church, to be no Saints, but Hypocrites.

It hath been shewed above in the Agitation of this Argument, That Saints by calling have denyed the resurrection, and have, been partakers of the Tables of Devils. And for the incestuous *Corinthian*, though the Apostle command him to be cast out of the Church : yet neither his crime nor his censure doth convince him to be an Hypocrite. He might be nevertheless a Saint by calling, and sincere in heart too, though in that Act, wicked, and scandalous in life. In the second Epistle, when *Paul* exhorteth the Church to restore him to former communion, he doth not speake of his censure, as the meanes of his first conversion to *Christ*, but only as the meanes of his humiliation, and repentance.

The incest which *Let* committed with both his Daughters was as Odious, and foule a sinne, as that of the incestuous *Corinthian*, in defiling his Mother in Law : yet the Scripture doth not brand him for an Hypocrite, but acknowledgeth him for a righteous soule, *2 Pet. 2. 8.*

Reply 3. I cannot assent to that which *Mr. Rutterford* saith, That *Paul* writing to the visible Church of *Corinth*, doth not speak to them as a visible, but as an invisible Church, when he calleth them the Temple of the holy Ghost. For *Paul* useth it as an Argument to the visible Church, and to all the Members of it (as well as to the invisible)

ble) that they should renounce Fellowship with Idols Temples, even from this stile, for ye are (saith he) the Temple of the living God: and what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols, 2 Cor. 6. 16. Paul when he writeth to Timothy about the Election and ordination of Elders and Deacons in the Church of Ephesus, and such other things pertaining to Church-Order, he therein looketh at Ephesus as a visible Church.

And yet when he summeth up the scope of his Epistle, these things (saith he) have I written to thee, *That thou mightest know how to behave thy selfe in the House of God, which is the Church of the living God, the Pillar and ground of Truth,* 1 Tim. 3. 15. If the visible Church of Ephesus, as administered by Elders and Deacons was the House of God, it was also the Temple of the Holy Ghost. In the former place of the Corinthians (2 Cor. 6. 16) The Apostle argueth the Church of Corinth to be the Temple of the holy Ghost, because the Lord said, I will dwell in them, and walke in them. And that very Act of Christs walking in them, the Lord himselfe vouchsafeth to the seven visible Churches of Asia, Rev. 2. 1. and the very truth is, if the visible Church of Christ as visible, were not the Temple of the Holy Ghost, (even as it is a ministeriall and governing Church) whence cometh all the spirituall efficacy and power, that is found in the Administration of the Word, and Sacraments, and Censures of the Church?

SECTION 4.

Having thus cleared our first Argument from the exceptions of Mr. Rutterford, it will be requisite to cleare it also from the exceptions of Mr. Baily, in his dissuative from the errors of the time, Chap. 7. page 165, to page 167. But yet I shall not need to repeat, what hath been already answered to Mr. Rutterford: which would fullfill this Treatise with needlesse Tautologies.

The forme which he casteth mine Argument into (which yet as he saith, is the best he can set upon it) he thus layeth downe,

If every Member of each Church, is not only in profession, but in sincerity

cerity and truth to be a Saint and faithfull : then the body of each Church must make Tryall, and be satisfied of the true faith, and sanctification of every Person, before they receive him into the Church.

But every Member of each Church, is not only in Profession, but in sincerity and truth, to be a Saint and faithfull.

Ergo, the Officers and Body of each Church, must make Tryall, and be satisfied of the true faith, and sanctification of every person, before they receive him into the Church.

Reply. This Syllogisme is none of mine (but Mr. Bailyes :) nor can it be gathered from any words of mine, in the place whence he fetcheth it.

My words be these,

In the way of our Churches, Chap. 3. Sect. 3. page 56. Wee receive none as Members into the Church, but such (as according to the judgement of charitable Christians) may be conceived to be received of God, into Fellowship with Christ, the head of the Church.

Then follow our Reasons, from the neare relation betweene Christ Jesus, and the Church, and the High styles which thereupon the Apostles give to visible Churches, and to their Members, (as Temples of the Holy-Ghost, Spouses and Members of Christ, children of God Almighty) which could not be given to them, except the Members in charitable discretion were such as the Holy Ghost describeth them) Saints by calling, (1 Cor. 1. 2.) and faithfull Brethren Collos. 1. 1, 2.) and that not only by externall profession (for these are too high styles for Hypocrites) but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

When judgement of Charity, and charitable discretion, are twice repeated, both in the laying downe our position, and in the conclusion of our Argument, methinkes, if Christian candour, did not, yet logicall reason should have enforced the expression of it, in the conclusion of his Syllogisme : which had he done, he had wanted colour of just exception, at least a great part of it.

For the argument then will runne thus (besides the true forme, which I intended and expressed above, page 52.)

If the Church, and Members of the Church, ought to be Saints and faithfull, not only in externall profession, but in some measure of sincerity and truth : then the Elders and Brethren

ren

ren, are not to receive any as Members into the Church, but such as in judgement and charity they conceive to be Saints and faithfull.

But the Church and Members of the Church ought to be Saints and faithfull, not only in externall Profession, but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

Therefore the Elders and Brethren are not to receive any, as Members into the Church, but such as in judgement of charity, they conceive to be Saints, and faithfull.

Let us now consider Mr. Bailyes answer.

Wee answer (saith he) no part of this Argument is sound: the Major, and the Minor, and conclusion are vitious.

The conclusion is two wayes vitious,

1. It commeth not neere the question, which should inferre a necessity to seporate from a Church, which neglecteth the due Tryall of their Members, and satisfaction of themselves in the true faith, and sanctification of their Members.

If this be not concluded, this Arrow misseth the mark.

Reply. Mr. Baily taketh his aime amisse if he think, we shoot our arguments (as Arrowes) at such a mark.

The Question of Seperation, is a distinct Question from this in hand: every delinquencie in a Church, (whether Officers, or Members, or both) doth not forthwith put upon us a necessity of Seperation, *Omnia prius tentanda*: necessity of Seperation is the last remedy of grosse and notorious scandals, after all good meanes, stil remaining incurable. Nevertheless there may be a lawfull expedience of removing from a more impure Church, to a more pure, without the necessity of seperation, as hath been opened above, in clearing the state of the Question in hand with Mr. Rutterford.

2. The 2d. fault which Mr. Baily findeth in the conclusion, is, That it concerneth not the Estate of reformed Churches, but the gathering of new Churches, or admission of Members into them. In which, there may seeme (saith he) to be some reason for the Tryall of their Members before admission: but the reformed Churches, who take themselves to be so farre true, that they need no dissolution, or new erection, they are not concerned in this case of admission. For their Members were borne in the Church, and had the Covenant sealed to them in Baptisme.

What

What tryall they take of their children, when they admit them to the Lords Table, is no wayes for their admission to be members.

Reply. 1. If our conclusion do not concern the estate of reformed Churches, then I hope, it doth not reach the disturbance of them. What reason then had Mr. Baily to say, *That our way of admission of members tendeth to dissolve, and unchurch all the reformed Churches?* But it seemeth, men transported with heat of disputation, will be put upon it by a wise hand of God, as well to oppose themselves, as their adversaries.

2. Though we acknowledge the children of the faithfull, born and baptized in the Church to be members of the Church; yet we do beleave, they ought not to be received as confirmed members of the Church, nor to be admitted to the Lords Supper (which is a Sacrament of Confirmation) til they have professed their faith, and repentance, and subjection to the Gospel of Christ before the Church. Which doth not tend to the dissolving, or unchurching of all reformed Churches, but rather to their purifying, and reformation according to the primitive pattern, as *Bucer* wisely adviseth in his *Scripta Anglicana, censurâ de Confirmatione*. But of that we have spoken before, and may (God willing) more hereafter.

This practise is a pillar of purity, and piety: not any pillar, much lesse main pillar of Anabaptisme, (as Mr. Baily calleth it) nor any ground of our sympathy or symbolizing with that Sect, as he saith. He is not ignorant (I suppose) that we are taxed for the contrary extreame, as being too rigid, and over-harsh to that Sect.

The major also (saith Mr. Baily) is vitious: for suppose the antecedent were true, (that every member of the Church is to be a Saint, and faithfull, not onely in profession, but in sincerity:) yet it will not infer the consequent, that the officers and body of the Church must take triall, and be satisfied of the true faith, and sanctification of every person, before they receive him into the Church.

Such a power in the people would make every one of them a Church-governor, &c.

Reply. It is Mr. Bailyes inference, and not ours; that because the members of the Church ought to be Saints, and faithfull, therefore the body of the people must take triall, and be satisfied in the true faith, and sanctification of those whom they receive into

into Church-fellowship with them. No, this is neither our judgement, nor praise. For though in the first gathering of a Church, the people do meet together, and do perform some duties of prayer and spirituall conference together, till they be well satisfied in the spirituall good estate one of another: yet this satisfaction reacheth no further then charitable discretion, which often falleth short of certaintie and sinceritie of sanctification. And after a Church is furnished with Elders, it is the Elders office to try the knowledge, and profession of such as offer themselves to the Church. And if in their judgement of charitie, they conceive them to be Saints, and faithfull, they present them before the body of the Church. And if the body have no just exception against their profession, or conversation, they are with common consent admitted as members of the Church, though it may be many of them in stricnesse, and exactnesse of judgement, are not fully satisfied in the truth and sincerity of their sanctification. But it is one thing to be satisfied in judgement of charitie: another, in truth of sinceritie.

Nor will this make every one of the people a Church-governor, to cast in any rationall exception against the profession, or conversation of any that offer themselves to their communion (which is all that the people do in this case:) no more then it made the Disciples, Church-governors, who when *Saul* assayed to joyne himself to them, they were afraid of him at first, as not beleeving that he was a Disciple: *Act. 9. 26.* There is a judgement of spirituall discerning, that belongeth to every spirituall Christian, (*1 Cor. 2. 15.*) and the same is joyned with some Ecclesiasticall liberty, and power in every Church-member, (*1 Cor. 5. 12.*) as well as there is a judgement of Rule or Government peculiar to Elders.

But against the satisfaction of the Elders or officers, *Mr. Bailly* pleadeth, *If there be any truth in it, that the officers should be satisfied in the true and sincere grace of their Members at their first admission, why not as well afterwards, when those who at first were taken for truly regenerate have thereafter fallen into such error in judgement, and such practises of life, as have given just ground to conclude the irregeneration of some, and to doubt the regeneration of others? Now if the uncertaintie of regeneration be a just cause to hold a man out of all Churches, is it not as just a*
cause

cause to cast a man out of the Church, when by doctrine or life this uncertainty appeareth, which at first was covered? Let none of our Brethren affirm, that the uncertainty of regeneration, nor the certainty of ir regeneration is a just ground to cast any man out of the Church, who once is come in. For this consequent runneth wide of the rigid Separatists: for the holinesse they require is expressly externall, which may stand with the inward wickednesse of hypocrites: but the consequent speaketh of inward sincerity, contradiistinguished from all outward professions.

Reply. This whole Argumentation proceedeth from an evident mistake of our Tenent, as if we required certainty of regeneration, and inward sinceritie in such as were to be admitted Church-members; whereas we expressly declare our selves otherwise, both in laying down our Tenent before our first Argument, and in the conclusion of the Argument it self, we expresse our Tenent thus: *We receive none at members into the Church, but such (as according to the judgement of charitable Christians) may be conveyed to be received of God into fellowship with Christ: [or which is all one, such as according to the judgement of charitable Christians, we may conceive to be regenerate.]* But Mr. Bailie carrieth it, as if I had said, *We receive none into the Church, but such as we are certain to be regenerate.* But there is a broad difference between these two: *We receive none but such as (according to the judgement of charitable Christians) may be conceived to be regenerate:* And this, we receive none, but such as we are certain to be regenerate. But, saith he, your consequent speaketh of inward sincerity, contradiistinguished from all outward professions.

Come we therefore to the conclusion of our Argument whence those words are fetched, and stretched.

The members of the visible Church (saith the conclusion) cannot be (as the Apostle calleth them) the members of the body, or the spouse of Christ, or the temples of the holy Ghost, or the sons and daughters of the Lord almighty, except in charitable discretion they be (mark that, in charitable discretion) as the holy Ghost indeed describeth them to be, Saints by calling, and faithfull brethren and that not only by externall profession (for these are too high stiles for hypocrites) but in some measure of sincerity and truth.

Now there is the same wide difference between these two, as was observed before in the former. It is one thing to say, the Apostle acknowledged the members of the Churches planted by

himself; to be members and Ipones of Christ, temples of the holy Ghost, sons and daughters of the Almighty: and therefore in charitable discretion he esteemed higher of them, then of hypocrites; he looked at them as *Saints, and faithfull brethren*, not onely in outward profession, but in some measure of sinceritie & truth.

And it is another thing to say, the Apostle gave them such high titles: and therefore he was certain of their regeneration, and of the inward truth of their sinceritie. The summe of the Argument tendeth to this scope; that as the Apostles received not, nor acknowledged Church-members, but such as in charitable discretion they conceived to be Saints, and faithfull brethren: no more should we. He that in shooting aimeth at the top of a mountain, though he do not alwayes reach it, yet he shall shoot higher, then he that aimeth at a molehil: so they that aime at receiving no members into the Church, but such as in judgement of charity are Saints, and faithfull brethren; they shall keep their Churches more pure, then they that indifferently accept carnall persons, and grosse hypocrites, if so be they will ordinarily hear the word, and receive the Sacraments.

As for Mr. Bailyes demand, *Why we should take such tryall of members at their first admission; and not as well afterwards, when they give just ground of suspicion of their irregeneration?*

He may please to understand, that we do call them to tryall upon far lesse offences, then such as give ground of suspicion of their irregeneration. There is no open scandall, whereinto any of our members do fall, but we call them to tryall about it, although many grosse offences will not give just ground of suspicion, much lesse of certaintie, of irregeneration. *Dauids* adultery, and *Lots* incest, *Noahs* drunkennesse, and *Peters* perjurie may justly suspend our suspicion of irregeneration in grosse offenders, when they formerly have made a good profession before many witnesses. And yet there is none of these offences, but may justly expose a Church-member to a new tryall, if he fall into them.

We have seen Mr. Bailyes exceptions against the conclusion of our Argument, as also against the major Proposition. He further proceedeth to except against the minor.

The minor (saith he) *we do deny as a very dangerous error, and avouch the contrary: every member of a visible Church is not in truth and sincerity a believer and Saint.*

Reply.

Reply. See whither heat of contention, and misguided zeal will transport an honest minde. This minor is not onely none of mine, but Mr. Baily well knoweth it to be none of mine. For take my Argument, as himself was pleased to cast it into a syllogisme, and the minor was this, (in the 163. pag. of his *Disswasive*.)

But every member of each Church, is not onely in profession, but in sincerity and truth to be a Saint, and faithfull.

Now there is a vast difference between these two; every member of a visible Church is in truth and sincerity a beleever, and Saint; and this, Every member of a visible Church is to be a beleever, and a Saint.

The former expresseth what a Church-member is, *de facto*: this latter expresseth what he is to be (or ought to be) *de jure*. This latter I own as a truth, and he himself owned it as my minor: yea which is more, he owned it also as his own Tenent. For thus he expressly declareth his own judgement, (pag. 156.) *We grant (saith he) it is earnestly to be wished, and all lawfull means would diligently be used both by Pastors, and people, to have all the members of a Church most holy and gracious.*

Surely then members of the Church (howsoever they be, yet) they are to be, that is, ought to be, holy and gracious.

If Mr. Baily study out some other meaning of, *Are to be holy, then ought to be holy*, he must then take the minor to himself; it is none of mine, either in words, or sence, or scope.

But against this Minor of his own making, he reasoneth earnestly.

This, saith he, is against Scripture, and all experience in every visible Church. All who are called are not chosen: In the field of God, there are tares among the wheat: in his fold, goats amongst the sheep: in his net, bad fishes among the good: in his house vessels of dishonour, not of honour onely. In the best Churches of the Scripture, we have too many bad members, Judas, Ananias, Saphira, Simon Magus, Hymeneus, and Philetus, Demas, and the like, &c.

All this we acknowledge, if not as a certain, yet as a probable truth, nor did we ever doubt of it. Onely this we beleieve, that none of these bad members were known to be such, unto the Church, when they were received members into the Church. It is true indeed of Judas, that Christ knew him to be an hypocrite

critic from the beginning. But his hypocrisie was hidden from all the disciples: they as soon suspected their own treachery to their Master, as his. And *Ecclesia* not *judicat de occultis*. Besides, Christ had some speciall reason, why he received him into his family, that the counsel of God, and the Scripture might be fulfilled, *He that eateth bread with me, bath lift up his heel against me: Psal. 41. 9. with Job. 13. 18.*

The proofs that they bring (saith Mr. Bailly) come not up to the Question.

And it is true, they come not up to the Question as it is stated in his invention: but they come up fully to the Question, as it is stated in our apprehension.

That in 1. Cor. 1. 1, 2: *sanctified in Christ, and called to be Saints*, if you understand it (saith he) of an outward calling alone, it is not pertinent: if ye understand it of an inward efficacious call, it is true, not of every member, but of some onely; as is clear by the Apostles complaint of many among them: of some for incest: of others, for injurious defrauding of their neighbours: of some for carnall schismers: of others for prophane drunkennesse at the Lords table: of others for fundamentall errors.

Reply. We understand, the Apostle intendeth it of an inward and efficacious call. And though it might not be true of every member, that they were all of them effectually called, and sanctified: yet it was true, that in the judgement of charity (which is the conclusion our proofs come up unto) they were all conceived by him to be effectually called and sanctified. For so in like sort, he saluteth the brethren at *Philippi*, as saints in Christ, (*Phil. 1. 1.*) and such Saints as were effectually called in his judgment. For he was confident of this very thing, that he which had begun a good work in them, would finish it to the day of Christ, *ver. 6.* And this he intendeth not of some of them onely, but of them all; for so he declareth himself, *v. 7.* *Even as it is meet for me to think this of you all, because I have you in my heart, in as much as both in my bonds, and in the defence and confirmation of the Gospel, ye all are partakers of my grace.*

The Apostles complaint of some of them in *Corinth*, will not alter the case there. The incest of one did not argue the hypocrisie of his estate, no more then that of *Lor.* The injurious defrauding of their neighbors, was not so great a wrong, as *Dauids* defrauding

ing *Vriah*, first of his wife, then of his sobriety, and then of his life; carnall schismes and divisions were to be found amongst Christs disciples, who should be the greatest: and carnall emulations in the disciples of *John* against the disciples of Christ. Their drunkenness was rather at their love-feasts, then at the Lords table; and but occasionally in either, not prophanely intended. Their fundamentall errors in denyall of the resurrection might as soon be incident to yong Christians newly converted from Pagancy, as it was found in *Peter* (concerning Christ) who yet was born and brought up, an Israelite, *Matth.* 16. 21. 22. In one word, there is no complaint which *Paul* maketh of any crime in the members of the Church of Corinth, but may be found, and hath been found in those that have been Saints, effectually called, not onely in the judgement of charity, but in sincerity, and truth.

The text quoted out of *Gal.* 1. 2: Mr. *Baily* saith true, it hath nothing sounding to the present Question. But that Quotation was not mine, but the mistake of the Printer, who took, *Col.* 1. 2: for, *Gal.* 1. 2. which Mr. *Baily* might easily discern from the words of the text, which I expressly transcribed, and quoted. For as I quoted Saints by calling, out of 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. so out of *Colos.* 1. 2: I quoted Faithfull brethren: which cometh as neer the present question, as Saints by calling. But to the Argument taken from the relation of the Church to the persons in the Trinity (which he calleth, the main, and third proof of the minor, but is indeed the first) he answereth,

That such priviledges must be understood of the universall and invisible Church; or when any of them are applied to a particular visible Church, they must be understood of that Church, not according to every one, but onely the living and gracious members thereof. &c.

Reply. We had the same Answer before from Mr. *Rutherford*: where to the same Reply returned to him, may serve here: and somewhat more may be added. As,

1. It is not meet, that the particular visible Church should be an heterogeneous body from the invisible Catholick Church. It were a monster in nature, if *Socrates* (a particular man) should be of an heterogeneous nature from *Homo*, which is an universall man, and as such, invisible.

2. The

2. The Apostle calleth the Church of *Corinth* (which was a particular visible Church) the temple of the holy Ghost, *1 Cor.* 3. 16. Where he speaketh of such a temple as may be destroyed, *v.* 17. which the universall invisible Church cannot. And of the same particular visible Church *Paul* speaketh, when he telleth them, *Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular: 1. Cor.* 12. 27.

3. *Paul* dehortheth the visible Church of *Corinth* from fellowship with the temple of idols, because themselves are the temple of God, *2 Cor.* 6. 16. He dehortheth the visible members also from fornication, from making themselves the members of an harlot, by a reason taken from their membership with Christ, *1 Corinth.* 6. 15.

4. The Pagan, who occasionally came into their visible Church-meeting, he was convinced by the power of the holy Ghost breathing in their administrations, that God was in them of a truth; *1 Cor.* 14. 24, 25.

5. *Paul* directing *Timothy*, how to order matters in the election and ordination of Elders and Deacons, (which all concern the visible ministeriall Church, as some call it) he telleth him, that he wrote these things unto him, that *he might know how to behave himself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth; 1 Tim.* 3. 15. Now between the house of God, and the temple of God, and the Church of God, I know no difference.

6. And whence is all that spirituall power and life, which the people of God do ordinarily finde in all the visible Churches of the Saints, in all their holy administrations, if Christ be not the head of those visible Churches, and if the holy Ghost dwell not in them? *Mr. Baily* may speak long enough of our leading men towards Anabaptisme, and Socinianisme: but (to speak the truth, as conscience constraineth me before the Lord) if I should intend to drive men to Enthusiasme, and Familisme (which is the worst kinde of Anabaptisme, and Socinianisme) I should take no other course, but these principles chiefly; why do men stand so much upon visible Churches, and their parity? They are neither temples of the holy Ghost, nor members of Christ, nor children of God almighty; these glorious stiles belong not to them, but to an hidden invisible company of Saints scattered universally, and invisibly

invisibly all the world over. And will not this strengthen the hands of Seekers and Familists, to seek Christ (where he is found in true spirituall life) in deserts and secret chambers? *Matth. 24. 26.* what stand we upon visible Churches, or ordained Elders, or censures? These are husks, and shels: the kernel, and Spirit of life lyeth in an hidden society. But surely it is neither good nor safe, topluck away from the visible Churches of Saints, I say not, their ornaments, and vails: but their very vitals, and cordials, which is the fellowship of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost breathing amongst them.

Reply 2. Whereas Mr. Baily saith, *That when any of these privileges are applyed to a particular visible Church, they must be understood of that Church, not according to every one, but onely the living, and gracious members thereof:* We say again (as we said before) they are to be understood of every one in that sence, which *Paul* expresseth it, to wit, in that Christian and charitable judgement, which he had of all their estates; even as his own words to the *Philippians* do plainly declare his meaning, *Chap: 1. 6, 7.* *I am confident (saith he) of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you, will also finish it unto the day of Christ Jesus. Even as it is meet for me to think this of you all, &c.*

But (saith Mr. Baily) if these places of the *Apostle* be extended to every singular member of every particular Church, the absurditie will be great. For so it will carrie to the *Pelagianisme* of *Arminius* in the extent of the true grace of God beyond the elect, to all the members of a visible Church; yea so it will reach to the totall and finall apostacy of many who are the temples of the holy Ghost, the members of Christ, the faithfull and sanctified children of God.

Yea (saith he) this Argument driveth further then any of the *Arminians* will follow. For howsoever they extend the true saving grace of God beyond the elect members of a Church: yet none of them ever said, that this sanctifying and saving grace must be in every person before they can be admitted members of any Church. For this is that grosse error, which *Independents* have learned, not so much from *Arminius*, as *Socinus*, to put all men unconverted without the Church, that so they may be converted (in this condition) by the preaching of private men: or if by Pastors, yet not as Pastors, but as private men, &c.

Neither do the *Socinians* (for ought I know) extend their Tenent thus

H

far,

far, to require all before they be members of the Church to be truly regenerate, as if the onely instrument of regeneration were the preaching of private men without the Church, &c.

Reply. These great absurdities are as easily avoided, as earnestly charged. For, 1. if we did hold, That all the members of every particular Church were truly sanctified, and regenerate, we would not stick to say, that they were elect also: and none of them truly sanctified, but the elect; and that none such ever fell away either totally, or finally. And surely the Apostle when he acknowledgeth the Church of the *Thessalonians*, to be in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus, and remembreth their faith, and hope, and love, and patience, he doth also acknowledge their election to be of God: 1 *Thess.* 1. 3, 4. And the Apostle *Peter* speaking of the Church at Babylon, calleth them, elected: 1 *Pet.* 5. 13. And surely so far as any Apostle, or orthodox writer calleth a Church, Saints, and faithfull brethren, so far do they acknowledge them, to be the elect of God, and accordingly freed by grace from danger of totall, or finall apostacy. What is then become of this heaue change of Arminianisme, or Pelagianisme?

2. We do not say, that every member of every particular Church is truly regenerate, and sanctified: but we say, that such they ought to be, and for such, the Apostles esteemed the Churches, and all the members of them (in their times) to be, according to their charitable judgement of them: nor can it be shewed that they willingly admitted any members into the particular Churches planted by them, but such as they conceived to be Saints, and faithfull, and the elect of God. Hypocrites when they appeared to be such afterwards, the Apostle accounteth them as false brethren, and therefore not suitable to the fellowship of Saints: and speaketh of them as creeping in, and therefore not received into the Church according to the right and due order of the Gospel. But can the Pelagianisme of *Arminius* be imputed to such, as conceive some to be Saints, who are not Saints, nor elect: and some reputed Saints (in judgement of charity) afterwards to fall away totally and finally?

3. But when Mr. *Baily* would bear us in hand, That we learned this Tenent not so much from *Arminius* as *Socinus*; I cannot but sadly consider, whether the heat of disputation will transport a zealous

longer minde! Suppose it were true (which is utterly false) that we should hold, *That sanctifying and saving grace must be certainly found in every person, before he can be admitted member of any Church:*

Yet how will he make it appear, that we learned this grosse error (as he calleth it) from Socinus? Doth Socinus himself, or the Socinians his followers, do they hold any such Tenent? I cannot speak of my self, (as not having their books at hand) but I appeal to Mr. Baily, whether the Socinians hold such a Tenent or no? His own words be, *Neither do the Socinians (so far as I know) extend their Tenent thus far, as to require all the members of the Church to be truly regenerate.* Then it seemeth strange to me, that he should say we learn such a Tenent of Socinus, when (so far as he knoweth) neither Socinus, nor his followers hold any such Tenent: and sure I am, neither do we our selves hold it, much lesse have we learned it from them; and least of all can Mr. Baily say it, who knoweth not whether they hold such a Tenent, or no.

And though we should hold it, (which is far from us) yet we should not therefore leave all unconverted men out of the Church (as he inferreth) that so they might be converted by the preaching of private men; and if by Pastors, not as Pastors, &c. For I have shewed elsewhere (in Answer to Mr. Williams Letter) that many children are born in the Church, to whom the Pastor is by his office a Pastor, whose conversion he is bound to intend, and attend. And besides, many hypocrites may, (and sometimes do) creep into the Church, whose conversion the Pastor is to labour after, in the Lord. And therefore let not brethren father upon us the learning of our tenents from Arminius, or Socinus, or their followers: with whom we have no communion, no not so much as themselves, who (for ought I know) are readie to receive them all, into the bosome of their Churches, whom we refuse.

SECT. V

Thus have we (by the help of Christ) clear'd our 3d. Argument (but the first of those mentioned in the way of our Churches) to prove, that such, and such onely are lawfully received into the fellowship of the visible Church of Christ, who do before the Lord and his people professe their faith in Christ, and subjection

to him, and do not deny him in their works: that is, such as in judgement of charitable discretion, we conceive to be Saints.

A 4th. Argument to prove the same conclusion (which is the 2d. Reason mentioned in the way of our Churches) is taken from *Act. 2. 47. The Lord added daily to the Church such as should be saved.* The Reason standeth thus:

Such, and such onely may we lawfully receive as additionall members to the Church, whom the Lord addeth to the Church. (But the Lord addeth to the Church such as shall be saved (at least in the judgement of charitable Christians:) nor do we read that he received others: And therefore such, and such onely may we receive as additionall members to the Church, as in the judgement of charity shall be saved.

The major Proposition was confirmed by the stewardly office of the Church and Elders thereof. We are not lords, but stewards of Gods holy things: and therefore as a steward is not to do any thing in his lords house, but according to the minde and will of his lord: so neither are we in Gods house, but according to the minde and will of Christ, receiving whom he receiveth: refusing whom he refuseth: casting out whom he casteth out. Whence Paul exhorted the Romanes to receive unto them the weak in faith upon this ground, because the Lord had received him: *Rom. 14. 1, 2, 3.*

The minor Proposition, That the Lord added to the Church such as should be saved, is the expresse letter of the text, *Act. 2. 47. saved at least, in judgement of charity:* nor do we read that the Lord added any (by way of ordinance) but such. What Answers are returned either by Mr. Rutherford or Mr. Bailly, (to spare the often repetition of their names, whom I honour) I shall only propound them in order, as objections, and return such Replies to them, as I conceive may suffice.

Obj. 1. Gods acts of speciall and gracious providence are not rules to us of duties. God addeth to the Church, as it is invisible and Christs body: it followeth not therefore, we are to adde to the Church visible, as visible. Gods adding is invisible by giving faith, and saving grace to some to professe sincerely: but because we see not faith, nor sincerity, therefore Gods adding cannot be a rule to our adding. God doth adde a person falling into open scandall to the Church invisible, having given him true faith: but the Church is not to adde him, but to cut him off. Nor is the place in *Rom.*

Rom. 14. expounded by any, except your selves, of receiving into Church-communion.

Reply 1. It is true, the acts of Gods speciall providence, whether of grace or judgement, are not rules to us of duty. And therefore though Christ elected and ordained *Judas* to the Apostleship, (to him a known devil, and traitor:) yet we may not elect, or ordain a known *Judas* to a pastorall office. The Lord cut off the first known hypocrites by death (*Ananias* and *Saphira*;) we may not do the like. These were acts of speciall providence, and of soveraigne power in the Church, and so extraordinary. But when the Lord is said to adde unto the Church such as should be saved, it is said also, he did it daily; *The Lord added daily to the Church such as should be saved.* That therefore was no speciall or extraordinarie act, but an act of daily dispensation; and therefore a pattern and rule to us.

2. The Lords act in adding daily to the Church such as should be saved, was not onely by giving them faith, and thereby adding them to the invisible Church: but by giving them an heart to offer themselves to the fellowship of the visible Church, and to professe their faith before them, and by opening the hearts of the Apostles and brethren to receive them. For the adding of them, and of such like to the Church, it is expounded of their admission into visible communion in visible ordinances. For so it is said of them, (v. 41, 42:) *They continued in the Apostles doctrine, and fellowship, and breaking of bread, and prayer.* These are acts of visible communion in the visible Church.

3. Though we see not faith, nor sincerity, (as God seeth them;) yet we see them in their fruits, to wit, in the profession of their faith, and in their outward Christian conversation. And therefore Gods act may be thus far a pattern to us, that as he added daily to the visible Church such as were in a visible state of salvation both before him, and men: So we may receive into the Church such as we conceive (according to Christian charity) are in a visible state of salvation. In brief, such as God daily added to the visible Church, such (according to our discerning) are we to receive into the Church.

But God added daily to the visible Church such as were in a visible state of salvation. And therefore we are to receive into the

the Church such as (according to our discerning) are in a visible state of salvation. If we could finde it written any where else in Scripture, that the Lord added daily to the Church ignorant, or prophane worldlings, who as yet gave no signes, nor hopes of their salvation, we should then think it safe to open the doores of h's house as wide, as he himself setteth them. But till then, let it not seem an unjust scrupulosity if (according to our weak discerning) we put a difference between the pretious and the vile: the righteous and the wicked: such as professe godlinesse, and such as professe it not.

4. It is true, God may adde an open scandalous person to the invisible Church by giving him faith: and yet the Church is not to receive him into their visible communion, but to cut him off, and refuse him. But this will not argue, That Gods adding proveth nothing. It may prove indeed, that Gods adding to the invisible Church, is not alwayes a pattern of our adding to the visible Church. But Gods adding daily such as shall be saved to the visible Church, and nothing else known of them but such things as do accompany salvation, it may justly lead us by the hand, to go, and do likewise: and not to do otherwise, unlesse we had as good a pattern for the contrary.

5. That place in Rom. 14. 1, 2, 3: where Paul exhorteth the Romanes to receive the weak in faith, because God hath received him; it argueth plainly:

1. That we may make it a rule to receive such into communion with us, whom God hath received: or else the Apostles argument were of no force: and yet to make Gods act our rule, is one thing denied us, in this objection.

2. That God doth receive the weak in faith, not onely into the invisible Church, but into the visible also. Which is no where said of men of no faith, or of false faith.

3. That therefore we are to receive men of faith (though of weak faith) into the Church, as God hath received them.

Neither is it a true exception, that the place (in Rom. 14:) is not so expounded by any except our selves:

Diodatus (a godly learned Minister of Geneva, and not any of us in Mr. Rutherford's fence) he thus expoundeth the place, Receive you] that is, saith he, into the communion of the Church, into the charity

charity, of your hearts, and into sweet Christian conversation, as a true brother.

But beside the Exposition of such a Commenter, the Apostle himself (the best Expofitor of himself) leadeth me to this Exposition. For he prosecuteth the same argument, throughout this Chapter, to the 12th. v. of Chap: 15. and in v. 7th. of Chap: 15. he reneweth the like exhortation (as in Chap. 14. 1:) by way of conclusion: *Wherefore receive ye* (saith he) *ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God; Now I say that Christ Jesus was a Minister of the circumcision, &c.*

The Argument standeth thus; If Christ a Minister of the circumcision received us Gentiles, to the glory of God, that we Gentiles might rejoyce and glorifie God with his people, then we Gentiles ought to receive them of the circumcision to glorifie God with us.

But Christ a minister of the circumcision hath received us Gentiles to the glory of God, that we Gentiles might glorifie God with the people of the Jews: v. 7, 8, 9, 10.

Therefore we Gentiles ought to receive them of the circumcision (howsoever scrupulous about *Moses* rituals) to glorifie God with us: the which is chiefly performed in the fellowship of publick Church-worship.

And the Apostle doth hereby repress and prevent the arrogancy of the *Romane* Ministers, lest any of them should say, I will not be a Minister to the circumcision; I am not called to be a Minister of circumcision, or of *Moses*, but of Christ, and the Gospel: and therefore let us not receive any of these Jews into our Church-fellowship; why, saith the Apostle, Christ was a Minister of the circumcision, and yet received us: why then should not we receive them to all brotherly communion?

Obj. 2. If where there is no shew of saving work of conversion (or regeneration) there the stewards of Gods house, should keep such out of the visible Church, because God hath not received them: then if any after they be received into the Church shall be found not to be regenerate, they should be cast out of the Church, because God hath not received them.

For it is the same power which casteth out of the Church, that holdeth out of the Church.

But we are not to cast any out of the Church for non-regeneration even known, except he break out into open scandals.

Reply. The connexion of the major is not necessarie. Non-regeneration notoriously known may be a just cause of holding out of the Church before a man be received: which yet is not a just cause of casting him out of the Church being received.

As in other relations grounded upon mutuall covenant, so is it here. A Christian may not lawfully marry an Infidell woman, because of her infidelity: yet if he have received her, he may not lawfully put her away, nor cast her off for her infidelity sake. The Church may not lawfully choose a man to the office of a Pastor, or Elder, who is self-willed, and not given to hospitality, (for it is against the rule, 1 Tim. 3. 2. Tit. 1. 7, 8.) But yet if an Elder be found to be such after he is chosen, I cannot say, it is a sufficient cause to cast him out of office. So here, non-regeneration evidently known may be a just cause of holding a man out of the Church, before he be received, which is not a just cause of casting him out of the Church, after he be received.

The Reason of the difference is from the diversity of Rules, which the Lord hath given to walk by, towards persons without, and those within the Church. To cast any persons out of the Church who are within the Church, the Lord hath allowed but two causes: 1. Obstinaeie persisted in, against admonition for an offence at first private: (*Math.* 18. 17.) 2ly, breaking out into some hainous crime against the light of Nature, 1 Cor. 5. 11. If an unregenerate man give no offence in either of these kinds, his unregeneration will not expose him to Church-censure otherwise. But when an unregenerate man is to enter into the Church, it is a sufficient cause of holding him out, if he make no shew of godlinesse; or if a shew, yet such a shew, as bewrayeth him to deny the power of godlinesse. For from such Paul wisheth Timothy to turn away, 2 Tim. 3. 5. And therefore not to receive them.

The Reason to the contrary will not hold. For though it be true, that it is the same power that casteth out of the Church, which holdeth out of the Church: yet they are not alwayes the same causes, which cast a man out of the Church, that hold him out of the Church, as hath been shewed.

2. I would not deny; but that non-regeneration being known (and

(and known publickly) may easily fall out (by the just hand of God) to be a just cause of casting out of the Church. For, suppose a man born and baptized in the Church, after he be grown up to yeers, do continue grossly and securely ignorant of the principles of Religion, I suppose, such an one may justly be esteemed unregenerate (for without knowledge the minde cannot be good:) and being such, he may justly be debarred from the fellowship of the Lords table, and such other Church-priviledges, as be peculiar to confirmed members. Suppose further, that such a person being admonished by the Elders and brethren of the Church, for his grosse ignorance, do neverthelesse still continue in grosse ignorance, and in neglect of means of instruction, and (as is the wont of such) suppose he be known to neglect Family Duties, prayer, Catechising of his household, examination of their profiting by publick ordinances, and shall after admonition for these known defects, still continue in his ignorance, and negligence, and that after publick rebukes for the same before the Church, I demand, whether such a person may not justly be cast out of the Church for his unregeneration, and these offensive fruits of it?

The Reasons against it will not here hold: which all fall into one: *De oculis non judicat Ecclesia.*

Reply. But these are known and palpable offences: and may be proved by many witnesses: and publick scandals they be, though they be rather sins of omission, then commission.

Say not God goeth before the stewards of his Church, in adding them to the visible Church (though they be unregenerate) when they professe the truth.

For such grossly ignorant persons cannot professe the truth: how can a man professe what he understandeth not? And if he could make some piece of a profession: yet he denieth the truth and power of it, whilst he bringeth forth no answerable fruits. Surely Christ would have had the dressers of his vineyard to cut down the barren fig-tree, and cast it out of the vineyard. And though the dressers interceded for respite another year: yet if it so continued the 4th. year, then they also thought it meet, to have it cut down. *Luk. 13. 6. to 9.*

Obj. 3. If the stewards in Gods house, should not adde to his Church, whom God doth not adde: it seemeth to infer, that all the people are stewards, and so officers, contrary to Gods word, *Eph. 4. 11. 1 Cor. 12. 29.*

Or that only officers admit Church-members, which is against our brethrens doctrine. For they teach, That the whole multitude of beleevers are onely to adde, and cast out.

Reply. We acknowledge no such doctrine for ours, That the whole multitude of Beleevers are onely to adde and cast out, when they are furnished with officers. For the officers are the stewards of Gods house by speciall calling: 1 Cor. 4. 1. And though we allow the multitude of brethren a concurrence and consent in the publick acts of the Church: yet we reserve to the Elders, that ruling power, which the Lord hath committed to them: 1 Tim. 5. 17. But so far as the Lord hath committed any concurrence of power in Church acts to the multitude of brethren, so far hath he made them stewards, or (which is all one) dispensers of that power: according to what we read, 1 Pet. 4. 10. *As every man hath received the gift, so let him minister the same as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.* Therefore, that the stile, and some act of stewardship should be allowed to all the brethren of the Church, is not abhorrent from Scripture language.

Obj. 4. *This Argument from Act. 2. 47. (as did the former) inferreth flatly, that no other must be received as members in a visible Church, but such as are first tried, and found to be really holy, and such as shall be saved. We would not be deceived with their distinctions of inward and outward holinesse, of seeming and reall grace, of charitable and veritable discerning. This conclusion beareth expressly, that none may be members of a visible Church, but those who shall be saved, and so who are truly elect.*

Reply. Neither the former Argument, nor this from Act. 2. 47. as it is framed by us, doth infer such a conclusion, That no other must be received as members into the visible Church, but those who are truly elect, really holy, and shall be saved. We infer no further conclusion but this, That as God added none to the visible Church, but such as should be saved: so we ought to receive none into the visible Church, but such as we in judgement of charitie conceive to be in a state of salvation. As Mr. Bailly would not be deceived with our Distinctions: so we would be loath, he, or any else should be deceived by them.

The Distinctions are made not to cloud, but to clear both the truth, and our judgements. If he be deceived in his apprehension of our meaning, it is not we that deceived him, but he deceiveth himself by forcing a meaning upon us beyond our words, and against our words.

Obj.

Obj. 5. This place of the Acts is detorted: such as were to be saved were added to the Church: is this indefinite Proposition to be understood universally, that all who were to be saved were added to the Church? Then men must be justified, and sanctified, and put into the way of salvation before they be admitted to the Church; and then though they were never added to the Church they may well be saved.

And then why do not they adde to their Church all that are to be saved? why do they exclude many, whom they grant to be truly gracious and elect, upon this ground alone, That they cannot approve of their Independencie, or Covenant?

Or suppose the Proposition to be universall: yet must it be reciprocall and convertible? Be it so, that all who were to be saved were added to the Church: yet must all who are added to the Church be saved? This is an evident untruth. Judas was made a member of the Apostolick Society by Christ: and many men were brought into the Church by the Prophets and Apostles, who shall not be saved. Shall damnation and want of true grace cast them all out of the true Church, and take from them the power and right to do the actions of Church-members?

Reply. 1. Is the place in the Acts detorted, when it is thus applied? The Lord added daily to the Church such as should be saved: therefore such as shall be saved are lawfully and fitly added to the Church, and none other but they who are conceived to be such. If this be a detortion, then it is a detortion and depravation of our wayes, to walk so as we have Christ for an example.

Whether the indefinite Proposition be universall or no, it is indifferent to us. It is enough to us, if the Lord added to the Church such as should be saved, and none but such, either in his own judgement, or in the judgement of the Apostles, and brethren of the Church. For mine own part, I beleve it to be the duty of all men that shall be saved to joyne themselves to some particular Church of Christ or other, if they have opportunity. But whether all the godly Israelites and profelytes did joyne to that primitive Apostolick Church, is more then I will affirm. It sufficeth us, that none else were said to be joyned by the Lord to the Church, but such as should be saved.

And such being justified, and sanctified, they might indeed have been saved, though they had not joyned: but yet they had sinned, if they had not joyned, at least assayed to be joyned. Church-ordinances may not be taken in vain: and they are vain to us, if

they be neglected; and neglect them we do, if we willingly live without them.

The objector is too credulous, if he beleeeve every such fabulous report, *That we exclude any from our Churches whom we grant to be truly gracious and elect.* We exclude none such, and much lesse, upon this ground alone, *Because they cannot approve of our Independency and Covenant.* We have received some members in our Churches, who are not onely Presbyteriall in judgement, but Episcopall also. Nor do I know, that ever we refused any approved godly person upon point of difference in judgment about Church-government. Nor do we pinch upon any godly mans conscience in point of Covenant, in case he be willing to professe his subjection to Christ in his Church according to the order of the Gospel. Nor do we limit him to our own way of the order of the Gospel, but as it shall be cleared and approved to his own conscience. *Facessant fabule, & parabolae*: A Citizen of Zion should not take up an evill report (much lesse, a false report) against his neighbour. As for the conversion and reciprocation of the Proposition, we say the same of it, as of the universality of it, before. It is possible the Apostles Proposition was neither universal, nor reciprocal, in the objectors sence. There must be some to be saved, not added to the Church: and there might be some added to the Church, who should not be saved. It is enough to us, if all those whom the Lord added to the Church were such as were to be saved, either in the judgment of the Lord, or in the judgment of the Apostles and brethren.

And I hope the Objector will not say, that that is an evident untruth. *The admission of Judas as a member into the Apostolick societie,* was not an act of Christs daily dispensation, but an act of his speciall and soveraigne power, and so extraordinary; and not to be taken up by us for our imitation. If we knew a man to be a traitor and a devill, we have no rule to elect or ordain him for a Church-officer: Yet if such a man be admitted into the Church either as an officer, or as a member, we do not hold, *That his want of true grace doth take from him the power and right to do the actions of a member, or officer,* till the Church upon just grounds have proceeded against him. It may be so (as the objector saith) that many men were brought into the Church by the Apostles and Prophets, who were not saved: But this remaineth to be proved by him, That they brought any into the Church, whom they did not conceive to be in a state of salvation.

¶ SECT. VI.

A Fifth Argument (but the third mentioned in the way of our Churches) tending to prove it to be no unjust scrupulosity, but our faithfulness, to admit no members into our Church, but such as we conceive to be faithfull Brethren, and Saints by Calling, is taken from *Mat. 16. 16. to 19.* The Argument standeth thus:

If the Lord Jesus make the Profession of the Faith of his Name (and such a Profession, as Flesh and Blood hath not revealed to a man, but his Heavenly Father) to be the Rock, or Foundation upon which his visible Church is built, then we shal build a Church without a Foundation, by receiving such Members into the Church as doe not hold forth such a Profession, but either through Ignorance make no Profession at all, or such a verball Profession, as savoureth not of any gracious work of the Father upon their hearts.

But the former is true, as appeareth by the Texts where Christ maketh *Peters* confession of Christ revealed to him by the Father, believed on, and professed by himselfe, to be the Rock on which his Church is builded.

Object. 1. "This maketh as much against your selves as against us, except all, and every one whom you admit, be builded upon this Rock. If there be Hypocrites in your Church (as you cannot deny it) then you build without a Foundation.

Reply. As it is with a particular Christian, so it is with a particular Church: as with a private member, so with a whole Church in matters necessary to their estate. A private particular Christian, that maketh not such a profession of Christ, as is suitable to a Christian conversation, he buildeth his house not upon a Rock, but upon sand, *Matth. 7. 24. to 27.* And so doth every particular Church, build upon a sandy Foundation, and not upon a Rock, and will not stand but fall in the day of Tryall, if their Profession be onely verball, without any favour of Christ in

heart or life. But yet if the body of the Church, or a considerable part of them make a good profession of Christ, which themselves doe not deny, but approve by a Christian conversation; the receiving of some Hypocrites among them, will not be a subversion of the foundation; nor of them that are builded upon it; but it will onely prove (that I may allude to the Apostles words) a building of hay and stubble upon a golden foundation, which will in time (if not healed) be consumed; but the Foundation and precious Members built upon it, wil stand. When every one in the Church at *Jerusalem* was an Hypocrite, and an evill doer, their wickednesse kindled such a fire of Gods wrath, as burnt them up like briars and thornes, *Isa. 9. 17, 18.* But if there be a remnant of an holy seed amongst them, they may be the substance and supportation of the rest, at least for a season, *Isa. 6. 13.* which may be a necessary and wholesome warning against the promiscuous and secure admission of all sorts of Hypocrites, and evill persons into the Church, without putting difference betweene precious and vile.

Object. 2. "By this Argument, *Peter* before this confession was "an unchurched Pastor, built upon no Church-foundation.

Reply. The words of Christ to *Peter*, are a promise of reward to his Confession, *That upon it he will build his Church*, not that thereby he was now admitted into the Church. For there was no Christian Church yet planted, but onely fit materialls prepared for it, gathered by *John Baptist* and the Apostles out of the lost sheep of the Church of *Israel*. Neither may it be said, That the Members of the Church of *Israel* were built upon no Church-foundation, or no Church confession: For every Israelite though borne in the Church, was to make an holy Profession (or Confession) before the Lord in his Tabernacle, when he was to present himselfe solemnly before the Lord, *Deut. 26. 2. to 18.* Besides, *Peter* himselfe, if he were baptised by *John Baptist* (as all the twelve Apostles were) he was admitted thereto by way of Confession, *Mat. 3. 6.*

Ob. 3. "By this place is not proved, That the Keyes are given "to the Church of Believers, but to the Ministers; for then against no Parochiall Church can the Gates of Hell prevaile. All "the Fathers with good reason, as *Augustine*, *Chrysostome*, *Cyrill*,
 115211

"Ter-

Tertullian, Hierom, Nazianzen, Cyprian, Ambrose, &c. and our Divines against the Papists (whom you side with in this) deny, that Christ meaneth here of the visible Church (as of Rome or Corinth) but of the Catholick and Invisible Church.

Reply. 1. The question in hand, is not to whom the Keyes are given, but what manner of persons are meet to be received Members of the visible Church. But if the Question here were, To whom the Keyes were given; The Objectors reason maketh no more against a Parochiall Church, then against the Ministers. For if the consequence be good, That in case the Keyes be given to the Church of Beleevers, then against no Parochiall Church could the Gates of Hell prevaile; then in case the Keyes be given to the Ministers, against no Ministers could the Gates of Hell prevaile.

As for those ancient Divines (whom he calleth Fathers) whom he alleadgeth to prove, that Christ meant not the visible Church, but the Catholicke and invisible Church: I shall make further Answer to them, when he declareth their Testimonies. It is not unusuall with them, to call every visible Church a Catholicke Church, which professeth the Catholicke Faith. And every visible Church in respect of the spirituall life, and nature of it, which is hidden, may be called Invisible. Otherwise, the name of an invisible Church is rarely to be found (if at all) in the Writers of those times, for ought I remember. As for our Divines, though some of them understand our Saviours words of the Catholicke invisible Church, yet all doe not. And they who doe understand his words of the Catholicke invisible Church, not of the particular visible Church, (as of Rome or Corinth) they speake it in regard of the possibility of defection of such a particular visible Church, against which in such a case the Gates of Hell doe prevaile. But such particular visible Churches as the Gates of Hell have prevailed against unto defection; they were not built upon the Rocks, nor upon Christ beleeved on and professed, by the Revelation of the Holy Ghost; For against such a particular visible Church so built, the Gates of Hell did never prevaile, to draw them to defection; no more then the Gates of Hell can prevaile against any particular Saint to draw him to defection. Whence it is shew at sundry of our Divines from this word,

doe prove the impossibility of the defection of any faithfull Saint, as wel as of the Catholick invisible Church. But let the Text be duely weighed : Is not the Church (in *Mat. 16. 18.*) called the Kingdome of Heaven (the Keyes whereof were given to *Peter*) v. 19? And will it sound for good Divinity, to say the Gates of Hell can prevaile against the Kingdome of Heaven? wherefore is it called the Kingdome of Heaven, if it be not above the pre-vailling assaults of Earth or Hell? Now that Kingdome of Heaven (of which *Peter* received the Keyes) is not onely the univer-sall Catholicke invisible Church, but the particular visible Church also : Or else *Peter* and other Elders dispense these Keyes in particular visible Churches, without a Commission. Now if a particular visible Church be the Kingdome of Heaven, it may be removed (as a Candlestick to another place;) but it cannot be extinguished; hence *Christ* threatneth the Apostatizing Jewes, that the Kingdome of God shall be taken from them, and as a Vineyard let out to other Husbandmen, but not destroyed, *Mat. 21. 43.* and *41.* Hence also the Lord threatneth the Church of *Ephesus*, That he will (in case of their impenitency) remove the Candlestick (that is his Church) out of that place; but not ex-tinguish it, *Rev. 2. 5.* Me thinks the servants of God should tremble to erect such a state of a visible Church (in hypocrisie and formall profession) as whose very foundation threatneth certaine Dissolution, and Desolation.



¶ SECT. VII.

Against the Argument propounded (and hitherto cleared in the former Section) there be other Objections raised by others: Let us follow them in order.

The next Objection (which after the former, is the fourth) is propounded by Mr. Bayly. Wee may not (saith he) admit, "That the Church founded upon the Rock, is every particular
"visible Church. The priviledges of the Catholicke and visible
"Church (he meaneth haply the invisable Church) which the
"Jesuits by all their wrastlings have never been able to extort
from

“ from us for their Idol of Rome, shall we throw them away upon every Independent Congregation? How unstable Rocks these Congregations are, and how easily by small temptations shaken in peices themselves may remember.

Reply. We doe not say, that every particular visible Church is founded upon the Rock, too too frequent experience demonstrateth the contrary; many are built upon the Authority and Lawes of the State, and many upon the hypocrisie of Professors; but this is it I say (as the Text saith) that every Church which the Lord Jesus buildeth, is builded upon this Rock, to wit, upon himselfe beleaved on, by the revelation of the Father, and professed before the Lord, and his people. Many Plantations there be (and so, many Churches) which the heavenly Father hath not planted; and they shall in time be rooted out, whether Churches, or Church-members, or Church-traditions. That the priviledge of stability against the Gates of Hell belongeth not only to the Catholick invisible Church, but to every particular visible Church built upon Christ by such an holy profession as Peter made, hath been declared in the end of the former Section; the Argument alledged to the contrary taken from the Topics of indignation against the Jesuits, and the indignity of a particular Church of Christ to enjoy the priviledge, which the Jesuits cannot get for Rome, might as justly be applyed against any particular faithfull member of a particular Church. Bucer and others of our judicious Protestant Writers, doe from this very promise of Christ, argue the stability of every true Beleever, and his impossibility of Apostacy. What if an Arminian should take up the objectors Argument, and say, ‘The priviledges of the Catholick and invisible Church which the Jesuits by all their wrastlings have never been able to extort from us for their Idol of Rome, shall we throw them away upon every particular Beleever? but if a particular Beleever or Saint may claime the priviledges, or promises made to the Catholick Church, I see no reason why a Church of Saints, and faithfull Brethren may not claime as much? The Church-estate of Saints doth not weaken, but rather confirme and increase the promises and priviledges given to Saints and Beleevers. And so (as hath been mentioned above) Paul applyeth a promise, and priviledge peculiar

o Saints and faithfull Brethren unto the whole visible Church of Philippi, Phil. 1. 6, 7.

The objector mistaketh us, if he think that we call every Independent Church a Rock; but we say, they are built upon a rock, if they be built by Christ, or if they be built upon such an holy profession of the faith of Christ as Peter made; if any of them have been shaken, and easily shaken in peices (as he saith) either they were not built by Christ, upon such a Profession as Peter made, or else their shaking hath been but a scattering of Seed out of a Garner into the open field, where every graine hath multiplyed to an handfull; as the Church at Hierusalem being scattered asunder, multiplyed into many Churches in Samaria, and Antioch, and elsewhere.

Obj. 5. 'The Rock whereupon the Church is builded, is Christ; we may not make any mans profession (be it never so cleare and zealous) the foundation of the Church in such a Fashion, that the ignorance or hypocrisie of any man may remove the foundation of any Church.

Reply. It is true, the Rock whereupon the Church is builded is Christ, yet not Christ sleighted or rejected, but Christ beleaved on, and professed; and as Christ beleaved on is the foundation of the invisible Church, so Christ beleaved on, and professed, is the foundation of the visible Church.

We doe not make any mans profession (though never so gracious or zealous) such a foundation of the visible Church, as that the ignorance or hypocrisie of any man can remove the foundation of the Church. Such a conceit cannot be wire-drawn out of any tenet of ours; but if there be some (though but few) who are built upon Christ, beleaved on, and professed (as there were but a few names of such in Sardin) yea (as there was, so) here is a true visible Church; the ignorance and hypocrisie of others cannot disannull the Church-state of the rest, nor remove Christ from being their foundation; yea further, if all the Members of the Church should make but a verbally, and ignorant, and hypocriticall confession of Christ, and of faith in him, yet I will not deny that such a society may have the name of a Church, and thus far, the nature of it, that the actions thereof are not nullities, though neither themselves, nor their actions

are

are acceptable in the sight of God, nor will stand in the houre of temptation.

Obj. 6. 'If none but the Elect, and those who are filled with the Holy Ghost may be members of Churches, then the Anabaptists have won the field. However, it is not true of Peter himselfe, who long before that confession was a member of the Church.

Reply. We willingly grant, That the children of beleieving Parents (Parents professing the Faith of Christ) are members of the visible Church; which whilst it is held and maintained, the Anabaptist can never win the field. But this membership of children (I meane Infants) is founded in the faith, and profession of their Parents, God accepting a Beleever and his seed, as when the fruit of a Tree is good, the Tree with its Branches are accounted good.

As for Peters Membership before that confession, it is answered above in the Reply to the second objection.

¶ SECT. VIII.

FOR the confirmation of the former Argument, taken from Christ his promise unto Peter, to make himselfe (so beleived on, and so confessed as was done by Peter) the foundation of his Church, there was added in the way of our Churches) a Parable or two, as an illustration of the same. The former was taken from *Mat. 22. 12.* 'where the Lord expostulateth with the Guest, 'that came into the fellowship of his Church, even unto his Table, not having put on a Wedding Garment; which expostulation seemeth also to intimate a taxation of them by whose connivance he came in.

Against this, two objections are made :

Obj. 1. 'The Text is contrary to the Argument, for in *vers. 9.* 'charge is given to the Ministers, to invite all; *Goe ye into the High-ways, and as many as ye finde, bid.* And their obedience is commended, *vers. 10.* *So those servants went out into the High-ways and gathered all, as many as they found, both good and bad.* This is a praising rather then a taxing; for as many as you finde is as good in sence, as good and bad; and the latter doth expound the

‘the former. The Lord commanded them to bring in as many
 ‘as they finde; they finde (in the streets) both good and bad,
 ‘therefore they were commanded to bring in both good and
 ‘bad.

Reply. 1. The charge given to the Ministers must be interpreted according to the nature of the businesse in hand; the charge was to invite all, as many as they found, and to bring them in, but not as they found them, but first to cause them to put off their beggerly raggs (which they wore in the Hedges) and to put on a Garment fit for the Marriage solemnity; else if it had been the Kings meaning (who gave the charge) to charge his Servants to invite all whom they found, and to bring them in as they found them, he would never have expostulated with him that wanted a Wedding Garment, for comming in wanting a Wedding Garment; for that man might soone have answered, I came in as I was bidden, as I was commanded; yea as I was (in some sort) compelled. The Answer is full and satisfactory to God and man, to alledge, and alledge truly, I have done what I was commanded from God, and his Messengers, and as I was commanded; I was commanded by them to come in to the Marriage, and to come as I was found, in my rags. Why am I taxed for doing as I was commanded? But in that such a Guest was found speechlesse, it argueth; Though he was invited to come, yet he was commanded also to put on a Wedding Garment, and had one offered to him for that purpose by the Servants, or if they did not offer it him, they were to blame; yea it argueth, he had made some shew of putting on the wedding garment, or else still the Servants were to blame to let him in; but if after he came into the house, he put it off, or made it afterwards appeare, that he did but assay to put it on, but did not in truth, then the Servants indeed are blamelesse; but such a Guest is justly left speechlesse, and inexcusable.

Reply. 2. As I have elsewhere answered to the bloody Tetter concerning the Parable of the Tares; so it may be said here, Commandements in Parables are not alwayes given as an injunction of what ought to be done by way of Ordinance, but as a Prediction of what will be done by way of providence. *Calvine* giveth an hint of interpreting that Parable (*Mat. 22.* with the paral-

parallel Parable, *Luke 14.*) in an historicall way, as the call of God hath been tendered to Jews and Gentiles in course of providence. The marriage Feast, which God made for his Sonne, was set forth from the beginning of the world. Foure severall Calls God gave to the sonnes of men to come to that Feast: The first call God gave as to some others, so chiefly to the Israelites; but that Nation alwayes resisted the call of God, as *Moses* and *Stephen* complained of them, *Deut. 9. 24.* *Acts 7. 51.* whence it is said, *Mat. 22. 3.* *They would not come.* And this was before the comming of Christ, when Israel after the flesh refused saving fellowship with the Lord Jesus in the sure mercies of his Covenant.

The next solemne call was given to them when Christ was come in the flesh, when Gods dinner was prepared, and his satlings killed, and all things were now ready. But the Jews fearing the losse of outward comforts, if they should imbrace so meane a Messiah, they set light by him, and dealt shamefully with his Ministers, beat them, and slew them; whence it is said, *They made light of the Feast, and the call to it, and went their wayes, one to his Farme, another to his Merchandise; the rest took his servants, and entreated them spitefully, and slew them, which so farre kindled the wrath of the King, that he sent forth his Armies (the Roman Legions) who destroyed those Murderers, and burnt up their City Jerusalem, Mat. 22. 4. to 7.* The third call is recorded by *Luke chap. 14. 21.* When the Master of the house sent forth his servants, to goe out quickly into the Streets and Lanes, and to bring in the poore, and maimed, and the halt, and the blinde. This seemeth to be the vocation of the Gentiles, (after the rejection of the Jewes,) by the Ministry of the Apostles, who quickly called the chiefe Cities and Villages of the World, but in them chiefly the meaner sort of men. The fourth call is mentioned in the same Chapter of *Luke (v. 23.)* when God sent his servants into the high wayes and hedges to call and to compell men to come in, that his house might be filled. And this call was given, when upon the ceasing of the primitive persecutions, God called in the Emperours and Princes, and great Rulers of the Earth to imbrace the Gospell of Christ, and to come into his Church, whose very example compelled many thousands to pro-

fesse Christianity and to come into the Church; as *Peters* example in another kinde (in prevarication) compelled many others with him to the like dissimulation, *Gal. 2:14*. The two last calls, *Matthew* joyneth; and in respect of this call it was said by him, That the servants gathered all sorts into the Church, good and bad; when indeed the watchfulnesse of Shepherds growing more remisse; all sorts of men (good and bad) crowded, and thronged into the Church. At which time one Guest (and such an one as carried a great traine with him, more then all the rest beside) sat downe at the Table, and openly profest against the wearing of the wedding Garment, the Righteousnesse of Christ by faith. This Guest was the Church of *Rome*, and the Pope, the head thereof, who by the ositancy of the servants, took up so great a room at Gods Table in the Church, that in respect of him, all the Christian Guests in the world were but few. And so our Saviours accommodation of the Parable is fitly inferred, *Many are called, but few chosen*. Otherwise, if this Guest, who had not on a wedding Garment, had been but one single person, the *Apodosis* (or Addition) of the Parable, had not fitly been inferred, *That many are called, but few chosen*; but rather the Inference had beene thus, *Many are called, and many chosen, and yet one of many not chosen*, which were contrary to our Saviours scope. If any shall thinke this interpretation of the Parable to be more argute then solid, let him enjoy his owne judgement; allowing the like liberty to others to accept it, if they see cause. But taking the Parable in this sense, The word of the King unto his servants, to call in as many Guests as they should finde, either the servants mis-understood it, to intend men of all sorts (good and bad) or else, it is not a word of injunction by way of Commandement what ought to be done, but a word of prediction, of what in time would be done in course of providence.

Object. 2. The very scope of the Parable is contrary to this (the taxing of the servants for admitting good and bad unto the Marriage Feast.) The scope is, That many are called externally, and so are of the visible Church, and that by Gods speciall Command, both here; *Matth. 22:9. 10.* and *Luke 14:17. 21. 24.* And yet few are chosen, & of the invisible Church. And *Luke 14* the Servants or Pastors call all (by the Lord of the Feasts Commandement)

mandement) without exception of regenerate or unregenerate.

Reply. That which already hath been returned to the former Objection, may suffice here also. But be it, that the scope of the Parable tendeth to shew, That many are called externally, and yet few chosen. For though Ministers call all their hearers to the grace of Christ; yet many refuse so much as subjection to an externall call, and doe openly professe their love of the pleasures and profits of the world (their Oxen, their Farmes, their Wives) rather then the love of God. And these are intended in the Parable, not so much as to enter into the Church, the house where Christs Marriage Feast is kept. Again, of those that come into the house, there may be not one onely, but one with a greater traine then all the rest of the Church beside, that hath not on a wedding Garment. And in respect of such also, who do enter into the Church, many may truly be said to be called, and but few chosen. For let the Ministers use as much diligence and vigilancy, as they well may; yet such is the dimnesse of discerning in humane frailty, and such is the subtilty of many hypocrites, that it may be ninety nine hypocrites may creep into the Church, to one simple sheep of Christ. Besides, many Ministers may mistake their Commission, and when they are commanded to call all as many as they finde, they thinke they may bring in as many as they call, though they be not onely poor, and maimed, and halt, and blinde (for so they may) but even such as are openly wicked (as well as the good) yea such as despise a wedding Garment, not onely of impured Righteousnesse (as the Papists doe) but also of externall holinesse; as prophane Epicures are wont to do.

Yea but the servants are said severall times to call all without exception of regenerate or unregenerate, and that by Commandment.

True, they are commanded to call all, even the unregenerate as well as regenerate; but they are not commanded to bring into the house all whom they call; but such as in obedience to their call, doe put on a wedding Garment, or at least professe so to do. Or otherwise, They themselves should as well displease their Lord, to bring in such unwelcome Guests to his Table, as the Guest

themselves did; that presumed to come to his Table, not having on a wedding Garment.

SECT. IX.

IF *Augustines* Judgement may be accepted in the interpretation of this Parable of the Guests, he consenteth with us, both in the sence of this, and of the other Parable of the Tares, which we also alledged (in the way of our Churches) as a confirmation and illustration of the truth in hand, that evill Persons openly known (even Hypocrites known to be such) are not to be received into the Church. For (said we) doth not Christ in the Parable impute it to the sleepinesse (that is, to the remissenesse and negligence) of his Servants, that Tares were sowne in his field amongst the Wheat? *Mat. 13. 25. 38, 39.*

In this point *Augustines* words may give light to both the Parables, in his Book, *De fide & operibus*, cap. 17. *Ab sit autem, ut sic intelligamus quod scriptum est, ad convivium nuptiam adductas, quos invenerunt bonos & malos, ut eos adduxisse credantur, qui se malos perseveraturos professi sunt. Alioquin ipsi servi Parvis familias zizania seminaverunt, falsumque erit illud, Inimicus autem qui ea seminat, Diabolus est, sed quia hoc falsum esse non potest, adduxerunt servi bonos & malos, sive qui latorent, sive qui jam adducti & intrinsece apparerent, &c.*

Ob. 1 But this interpretation (of the Parable of the Tares) doth but strengthen the Anabaptists, who alledge the same. **Reply.** If the Anabaptists alledge this Parable, to prove, that either no hypocrites are found in the visible Church, or if they be, that we are to separate from such Churches, neither *Augustines* interpretation thereof, nor ours doth strengthen them therein. But if they should alledge it for this end, to argue the sleepinesse or remissenesse of Christs Ministers, when knowne Tares are received into the Church, I say no more, (but as *Bellarmino* sometime spake of *Calvin* in another case, so I of them) *utinam sic semper errassent Anabaptistae.*

Ob. 2 It is a fault which a very Popish Doctor *Aquinas* condemneth, to argue from Parables; *Theologia Symbolica non est Argumentativa.*

Reply. I am not ignorant, better Divines (I mean, more orthodox)

thodox) then *Aquinas*, say as much. But by his leave, and their favour, I thinke the speech is neither Logically, nor Theologically, neither good Logick, nor good Divinity. Not good Logick, for *Comparata etiam ficta arguunt*. And if they doe *Arguere*, they are *Argumentativa*. Nor good Divinity: For if all Scripture be profitable, *πρὸς διδασκαλίαν καὶ ἐλεγχον*, then Symbolicall. And why should Christ (as well as some Prophets before him, and *John* the Apostle after him) delight so much in Symbols and Parables, if they were not Doctrinall and Argumentative? It is true, the Legs of the lame are not equall; so is a Parable in a fools mouth, saith *Solomon*. But Christ (the wisdom of the Father) was no foole: He would never have so much accustomed himselfe to Symbols and Parables, if so much of them were to be pared off (as husks and shels) in the interpretation thereof (as commonly is done by Expositors) or if Parables were not effectually Argumentative to all those ends of Ministry, for which any other word of Doctrine might serve? Evident it is to any that shall observe and meditate on the Parable of Christ without a forestalled prejudice taken from that Thomistcall unsound principle, That whether Christ be to teach, or convince, or reprove, or confirme, or comfort his hearers; all these ends he both intendeth, and attaineth in his Parables. I never yet observed any part of a Scripture Parable, but without carnall affectation, or straining of wit; it might holily be applyed both with power, and profit, and delight to an honest heart. I know great Divines have been (I fear) too shy of searching particularly into the interpretation of Scripture Parables. But I beleeve that shynesse hath sprung from that Axiome of *Aquinas*, which after him obtained too great credit in the Schooles of Divines; For before him, ancient Divines erred too much on the other hand, both in turning plaine Scriptures into Parables, and in squeezing many curious notions out of Parables, which the Holy Ghost never intended.

Ob. 3 But it is not said in the Parable, that the envious man sowed Tares, while the servants slept, but whilest men slept:

Reply. But if the men that slept, had not been the servants that slept, other mens sleeping had given the Enemy no more opportunity

tunity to sow his Tares, then if they had been awake. For if other men (who are strangers) see one thing, or other, sowne in a field, they matter it not.

Besides, if the Servants were awake, and saw the envious man sow the seeds in the Field, why should they make themselves ignorant, how these seeds came to be sown there?

Yea (as *Augustine* saith right) the Servants themselves had sowne these Tares in the Field, If they had admitted known evill ones into the Church.

Ob. 4 *Cajetan* saith, Here is not accused the negligence of Pastors.

Reply. Cardinalls, and Popish Prelates (such as he was) had need to say so; else they should condemne their own negligence, and security with their own mouths.

Ob. 5 'But it is beside the Text, that by the sleeping of men should be understood the negligence of Pastors, neither is it at all expounded by Christ.

Reply. Christ doth not expound sundry of his Parables at all; nor doth he expound all the parts of any Parable: but when he hath opened the maine scope, he leaveth other parts to be expounded, according to the scope of his Doctrine in hand, and the Analogy of other Scriptures.

It is true what the Objector saith, That men cannot see the hollownesse and falshood of Hypocrites, till it break out in their actions, no more then the sleeping Husbandman can see, when weeds grow up in his Field: And that is it, which Christ signifieth by the sleeping of men.

But then by the sleeping of men should be meant, the sleeping of the Servants, which the Objector even now would not admit.

Besides, whether men sleep or wake, Weeds will grow in the Field, nor be discerned till time of open difference come on.

Ob. 6 'If the Lord here condemne the sleepeinesse of Ministers, for suffering scandalous Professors to bee members of the Church, how doth the Lord forbid those Servants to plucke up those Tares, but to let them grow till Harvest? For he commandeth the Officers to cast out of the Church, and to excommunicate scandalous persons.

Reply.

Reply. All are not openly scandalous persons and excommunicable, who are Tares, It may be some are good Wheat, whom the Servants may take for Tares; and so in plucking up Tares, they shall pluck up wheat also.

2 It hath been shewed above, that though known Hypocrites are not to be received into the Church; yet being received, they are not to be cast out meerly for hypocritie, til it break forth into notorious scandall.

3 I deny not, That the word of Command to suffer the Tares till the Harvest, may be rather a Prediction of what will be done in the Church by course of providence, then an injunction what should be done by way of Ordinance.

Object. 7 'But certainly seeing the Field is the Field of the visible Church, It maketh for us against our brethren, that wicked men are growing in the visible Church.

Reply. I willingly grant, that the Field is the Field of the visible Church dispersed in any part of the world, and am far off from the Exposition of such as meane it of the world out of the Church. But yet this maketh nothing at all against us, who doe acknowledge, that not onely Hypocrites, but oftentimes more open wicked men are growing in the Church. Else how come openly wicked men to be cast out of the Church, if they were not growing in it? But this we say, That neither openly wicked men should be tolerated in the Church, nor known Hypocrites received into the Church.

¶ SECT. X.

A Sixth Argument (but the fourth alleadged in the way of our Churches) was fetched from 2 Tim. 3. 5. where the Apostle forbiddeth us to joyne with such, yea commandeth us 'to turne from them, who have a forme of godlinesse, but deny the power thereof.

To this is objected by way of Answer:

Object. 1 'So our Brethren by this Argument professe the lawfulnessse of separation from all persons and Churches, except from their owne.

Reply 1 In that place the Apostle foretelleth, That in the latter

ter dayes shall come perillous, (and as the word signifieth) difficult times; and the reason thereof he giveth to be, the vicious qualifications of Christians : For men (saith he) shall be lovers of themselves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, (or slanderers) disobedient to Parents, unthankfull, unholy, &c. lovers of pleasures, more then lovers of God, v. 1, 2, 3, 4. And that which maketh the times the worse, these ill conditioned Christians, shall professe a forme of godlinesse, though they deny the power of it, v. 5. For the redresse whereof, and for the preservation of the honour of the Name of Christ, and of the purity of his Churches, the Apostle prescribeth this remedy. From such turne away. Therefore say we, It is according to the will of God, and the counsell of the Apostle, not to receive such into the fellowship of our Churches but to turne away from them.

‘Yea but (saith Mr. *Rutherford*) our Brethren by this professe ‘the lawfulnessse of separation from all Churches (and persons) ‘except from their own.

But (say we) by this Mr. *Rutherford* confesseth, that all Churches besides our owne, consist of many such ill qualified members, as make the times wherein we live more difficult and dangerous; or else there were no ground for his objection. And if all Churches be ill qualified, how then can the Churches (without manifest prevarication) come and confesse before the Lord (especially in dayes of solemne Humiliation) That the times are difficult and dangerous, and that in respect of the evill conditions and courses of Church-members (such as are here described) and yet we our selves admit such into our Churches, yea and justifie our receiving of them? Can we pray for the healing of such perillous and difficult times, when our selves make the times perillous and difficult by receiving such grosse Hypocrites into nearest visible communion with the Lord and his Saints, yea and justifie our practise in so doing? Can a man looke to be justified from such sinnes, which he himselfe justifieth in the encouragement of others that live in them? were it not that the Lord hath said, He dealeth not with his children according to their works; And that where sinne aboundeth, Grace doth superabound; we could never expect a change and serious Reformation of these evill and difficult times, whilst such vicious Hypocrites are admitted

mitted into Churches, and their admission and toleration justified. It is not such ill conditioned persons in the world that maketh the times perilous, but their admission and toleration in the Churches.

Reply 2 Calvin judgeth that these Qualities expresse a lively description of the Romish Clergy and *Monkery*. And have not all the Reformed Churches justly turned away from them?

Reply 3 This Commandement of turning away from such, doth chiefly concerne Church-Rulers, and with them the Churches themselves. And though we be commanded to turne away from such ill-qualified Hypocrites; yet we are not forthwith called to turne away (or to separate) from such Churches and Congregations of Saints, who doe not streight-way turne away from them. We may justly conceive, the Churches tolerate them as burdens, and groane under them, and cannot be eased of them, the greater part over-pouring the better. We are not to withdraw our selves from our Neighbours Horse or Oxe groaning and falling under his burden; much lesse from our Brethren, or from Churches in such a case. But yet if any of the Saints wearied with the burdens and iniquities of the times, when they cannot cast off their burdens in their present fellowship, shall withdraw themselves from that fellowship (wherein they finde it difficult and perilous to bear such burdens) and yet still continue fellowship with their holy Brethren in all those holy things wherein they may keep fellowship with them without fellowship in sinnes; we beleeve such withdrawing, will fall under the Apostles Precept here. For in so doing, we turne not away from the Saints, but from the ill qualified members amongst them.

Object 2 No marvell, if Paul will have Timothy to separate from Apostates, from Resisters of the truth, v. 8. and from Proud, Boasters, Blasphemers, Traitors: For such are to be excommunicated, as 1 Tim. 6. 3. 5. *At loquitur Paulus de Fundamentali corruptione istius Doctrinae quae est secundum pietatem*, saith Parker. But Paul here forbiddeth to exhort the Proud, and malicious Blasphemers, and Resisters of the truth, and not to wait upon them any longer. Whereas otherwise he had said in the end of the preceding Chapter, v. 24 25, 26. Those who are detained in the snares of Sathan must be waited on, and instructed, if God will.

‘give them Repentance. Ergo, Timothy was as a Pastor to instruct
 ‘unconverted persons, and to joyne in communion with them.
 ‘But as for desperate Enemies, and Blasphemers, he was not to
 ‘wait on them, nor to instruct them with meeknesse. So that if
 ‘this Text prove any thing, it will conclude against our Brethren,
 ‘That such as deny the power of godlinesse, should not be hear-
 ‘ers of the word, and much lesse (as our Brethren reason) mem-
 ‘bers of the visible Church.

Reply 1. If such persons (as the Apostle here describeth) be to
 be excommunicate (as Mr. Rutherford saith) to wit, when they do
 notoriously appeare to be such, it is as much as we desire. For
 then if they doe appeare to be such a forehand, they are not to bee
 received into the Church. Howsoever due watchfulnesse in
 Church-officers is here requisite; for these vicious Qualities are
 such as are not at first easily espied without due observation. For
 saith Calvin, ‘Ejusmodi vitia enumerat Paulus, quæ non protinus appa-
 ‘rent: imò quæ fictam sanctitatem ut plurimum comitantur. Quis enim Hy-
 ‘pocrita non superbus, non amans sui, non aliorum contemptor, non ferox ac
 ‘crudelis? non fraudulentus? sed hæc omnia latent hominum oculos.

Reply 2. What Parker speaketh of the fundamentall corruption
 of Doctrine, hath not reference to this place, but to 1 Tim. 6. 3. 5.
 Nevertheless I easily grant, those whom Paul here describeth
 may easily wax worse and worse (as Paul saith, 2 Tim. 3. 13.) and
 so may become like to those in 1 Tim. 6. 3. 5. But yet before they
 grow on to such fundamentall corruption of Doctrine, they
 may be turned away from, when such morall vitious Qualifica-
 tions are discerned in them.

Reply 3. As for those in the preceding Chapter, who were de-
 tained in the snare of Satan, and whom Timothy was to instruct
 with meeknesse, proving if God will give them Repentance. It
 doth not appeare, That Timothy was a Pastor to such; or that
 knowing them to be such, he was to joyne in communion with
 them. These things are *hypothetica*, meere suppositions without any
 colour from the Text. He might be an Evangelist to them, and
 so preach to them all publickly, and confer with them privately,
 as a Pastor also may doe; but not to joyne in Church fellowship
 with them, whilst they are under the snare and captivity of Satan
 to do his will. For what fellowship hath Christ with Belial?

Reply 4.

Reply 4. When the Objection saith, Though *Timothy* was to exhort those in the end of Chap. 2. but not to exhort these in Chap. 3. and therefore that such should not be hearers of the word (which he thinketh maketh against us.)

I see no ground for such an Inference. For not onely morall vicious persons, but even proud, blasphemers, and resisters of the Truth, may heare the word if they will; and if such come into the Congregation, whilst *Timothy* is preaching, must he break off his Sermon, lest they should heare it? yea, may he not apply a word of conviction to such? (unlesse he knew they had sinned against the Holy Ghost) *Ti. 1. 9.*

Ob. 3. (which is Mr. Baylies) this consequent is naught, saith he; *Paul* biddeth *Timothy* to turne away from such, who have a forme of godlinesse, but deny the power thereof. Ergo, They who are not found to have positive and satisfactory signes of Regeneration, ought not to bee admitted Members of any Church.

Reply. We gather no such consequence, as Mr. Bayly is pleased to fatten upon us: But our consequence is this, *Paul* biddeth *Timothy*, to turne away from such, who have a forme of godlinesse, but deny the power thereof. Therefore the Elders of the Churches are not to admit such into the communion of the Church, as have no better shew of godlinesse, then what is joyned with the deniall of the power of it.

Ob. 4. The Apostle speaketh of persons openly scandalous and flagitious.

Reply. *Paul* doth not say, That they were such at first, (and so *Calvin* interpreteth him) but that in time they waxing worse and worse, will manifest themselves to be such, *1. 9. 13.*

Ob. 5. The Apostle speaketh of such as are to be cast out after their admission. But our Brethren will not cast out all, of whose Regeneration they are not convinced, &c.

Reply. Turn away from such, doth rather expresse a separation from such, or a diversion from admitting such unto communion, then a proceeding to the casting forth of such out of communion. But grant it to be so, as the Objector saith; yet when such shall shew forth the inward hypocrisie of their hearts, by some open scandalous crime in Doctrine, or manners; in such a

case we should think it meet to cast out of our fellowship any such of our own members; as are so qualified: And we should think it also lesse meet to admit them into our fellowship.

¶ SECT. XI.

A Seventh Argument (but the fifth laid downe in the way of our Churches) was taken from Rev. 2.4. where such as leave their first love (as all Hypocrites will at length do) are argued to procure the removall of the Candlestick. And therefore they being more fit for the ruine and destruction of the Church, are not to be judged fit materialls for the constitution and edification of it.

Against this, the chiefest objections arise from miscasting the Argument, not as the words offer themselves, but as they may lye most obvious to exception. The words do of themselves offer this Argument.

Such as are destructive to the estate of the Church, are not fit materialls for the building of the Church; and being so discerned, ought not to be received as members into the Church.

But Hypocrites and backsliding Professors, are destructive to the estate of the Church, Rev. 2.4.5.

Therefore Hypocrites and backsliding Professors, are not fit materialls for the building of the Church, and being so discerned, ought not to be received as members into the Church.

Ob. 1. The Argument must thus be formed:

All those whom God intendeth shall edifie, and not ruine the Church, are onely to be members of the visible Church:

But all known Hypocrites are such. Ergo, &c. The Proposition is false: For if we speake of Gods secret intention and decreeing will, It is not a Rule for the Church to square and regulate their actions by. God may intend in his decreeing will, that many Hypocrites, such as *Judas* and *Demas* shall be Church-members. If we speake of Gods revealed will, the Proposition is still false; for by our Brethrens Doctrine, it is Gods revealed will, That the Church receive (as members) latent Hypocrites, such as *Simon Magus*, and yet latent Hypocrites are no lesse unfit materials to build the Church, then knowne Hypocrites.

Reply.

Reply. We freely acknowledge Gods secret intention and decreeing will is no Rule to the Church to order his affaires by it, but onely his revealed will signified in the Scriptures. Now it is revealed in the Scriptures, That Hypocrites and backsliding Professors are destructive to the Church, *Rev.* 2. 4, 5. And God hath given no power elther to the Church, or Church-officers, to doe any thing to the destruction, but onely to the edification of the Church, *2 Cor.* 13. 10. and *Chap.* 10. 8. And therefore by the revealed will of God, neither the Church, nor the Church-officers have power to receive into the Church knowne Hypocrites, or backsliding Professors.

Why (saith the Objector) by your owne Doctrine, latent Hypocrites may be received; and yet latent Hypocrites are no lesse unfit materialls to build the Church, then knowne Hypocrites.

Reply. It is not true, that latent Hypocrites are no lesse unfit materialls to build the Church, then known Hypocrites. For a latent Hypocrite may be furnished with many and great edifying gifts, when yet he is destitute of regenerating grace; and when his hypocrisie commeth to be knowne by some open scandall, his best edifying gifts will be then blasted, and made unserviceable to the Church. *Judas* and *Demas*, the one had the gifts of an Apostle, the other of an Evangelist; and both of them were of great use to the edifying of the Church. But when their hypocrisie came to be knowne (*Judas* by his Treachery, and *Demas* by his Apostacy) both their gifts were now blasted, and made unprofitable to the Church. The talents which they had, and the use of them to the Church was taken from them.

Ob. 2 We doe not thinke, That Hypocrites fallen from their first love, and by scandalous living declaring themselves to bee such, should be kept in the Church.

Reply. Be it so: Then such being out of the Church are much lesse to be received into the Church, till they professe their Repentance.

But (saith the Objector) the Author so alledgeth, *Rev.* 2. That the Church of *Ephesus* falling from her first love, must be a false-constituted Church, in which there were members fitter to ruine, then to edifie the Church. And yet certaine it is, *Paul* (in

‘*Eph. 1.*) and Christ (*Rev. 2.*) acknowledgeth the Church of Ephesus to be a true visible Church.

Reply. And so doth the Author too, and never doubted of it, which maketh him wonder, why the Objector should father upon him such an intention in his Allegation of *Rev. 2.*

But Mr. Bayly is far more adventrous in fathering an Argument upon me out of this Text, and more censorious in judging of it. The Argument he casteth thus:

‘No Hypocrite, none who at last will leave their first love, are to be admitted into the Church. For all such will ruine the Church, and procure the removing of the Candlestick. But all that cannot prove their Regeneration, convincingly are such.

Whatsoever the major Proposition may bee, doubtlesse this minor is no Assumption of mine, but his own presumption.

But what is his answer unto this Argument, such as it is? After the two former it will make a third Objection: ‘This is (saith he) a bold and rash Argument, laying a necessity to exclude all Hypocrites from the Church, and all such as may fall away from any degree of their first love.

Reply. The Argument, as I said it downe above, layeth no necessity upon the Church to exclude all Hypocrites; but knowne Hypocrites; much lesse, to exclude all such as may fall away from any degree of their first love. For what Saint of God is there, but may fall away from some degree of his first love? who can excuse *Asa* in this case? or (if you thinke good) *Solomon* also? But *Asa* is one thing, *Asa* another. The best may fall away from some degree of their first love (which is *Asa*) who yet doe not fall away from their first love, which is *Asa*.

‘But (saith he) The minor is very false; for many gracious persons far from hypocrisie, and free from all decay of their first love, may be unable to satisfie themselves, or others in the certain truth of their Regeneration.

I consent with him herein; but let him know therefore, this Minor is none of mine, but his own prelyce.

‘But the Major (saith he) is more false, against the practise of Christ and his Apostles, who did alwayes receive divers Hypocrites: And our Brethren doe not deny, that they do so also; for their

their Churches consist not all of real Saints.

Reply. I dare not be so bold, as to say (though many thinke some of my expressions bold and rash) That Christ and his Apostles did alwayes receive divers Hypocrites. Sure I am, when Christ received Peter and Andrew into his fellowship (Matth. 4. 18, 19.) they were neither of them Hypocrites. And when soone after he received James and John (Matth. 4. 21, 22.) neither were they Hypocrites: nor doe we read that at those times he received divers Hypocrites with them. Yea when many did beleeve in his Name, he did not receive them into any heart communion with him, because he knew their hypocrisie, Joh. 1. 23, 24, 25. And though he received one Judas an Hypocrite and Traytor: yet his hypocrisie was not openly knowne, but his spirit as well approved amongst the Apostles, as their owne (Matth. 26. 22.) And Christ had a speciall ground for receiving him, that the Scriptures and counsell of God might be fulfilled, Luke 22. 21, 22. with Ioh. 13. 18, 21.

And for the Apostles, we never read, That they received any knowne Hypocrites: though true it is, that some of them whom they did receive, did afterwards discover their owne hypocrisie. As for our selves, though we neither dare, nor will deny that we doe receive some Hypocrites: yet neither alwayes, nor known Hypocrites, nor with allowance of our selves therein, if we should so do.

Ob. 4. However, the Text it selfe proveth our Tonet; for Ephesus to Christ there is a most true Church, notwithstanding their fall from their first love, and his threatning of them with removall of their Candlestick, &c.

Reply. Touching the superlative truth of the Church of Ephesus as it then stood (That it was to Christ a most true Church) I have little to say. For if *forma stat in indivisibili, et neque recipit magis, nec minus*; then it is enough if it were a true Church at that time (as I beleeve it was) though it were not stiled a most true Church. But if the truth of a Church be capable of degrees of comparison (as in some sense it is, in respect of purity) I suppose, it might rather be called a most pure Church, when it was fervent in her first love to Christ, then afterwards when she had left her first love. Paul did foretell to the Elders of Ephesus, That after his departure,

ture, grievous Wolves should come in amongst them, not sparing the flock; and that out of themselves should men arise speaking perverse things to draw Disciples after them; *Act. 20. 29, 30.* which if it came to passe in *Iohns* time under *Domitian* (after *Pauls* departure under *Nero*) surely the Church had lost something of the superlative truth of her profession, though it did retain some positive truth of her Church estate.

¶ SECT. XII.

FOR an illustration of the Point in hand, I did instance cursorily in a Type or two of the Old Testament, which yet are not without their due weight. We passe by (said I) the Types of the Old Testament. Rough stones were not laid in the building of *Solomons* Temple, till they were hewne, and prepared before, *1 Kings 6. 7.* And behold a greater then *Solomon* is here, and a greater Temple, then that of *Solomons*.

The attendance and watchfulnesse of the Porters suffering none to enter into the Temple, that were unclean in any thing (*2 Chron. 23. 19.*) doth it not evidently type forth the watchfulnesse of the Officers of the Church of Christ, to suffer none unclean (unclean in estate, or course of life) to enter into the fellowship of the Church, which ought to be a communion of Saints.

Ob. 1 'In this Argument many things are loose and doubtful; i. we desire a warrant from the word, that the Temple was a type of the visible Congregation; and that all must be as really holy before they enter into a visible Congregation as they be hooved to be typically holy, before they entred into the Temple of Jerusalem?

Reply. The Temple was a type of the body of Christ, both of his naturall body (which was the Temple of the Godhead) *Ioh. 2. 21.* and also of his mysticall body, the Church; and that not onely of the invisible Church (which it is more seldome brought to represent) but ordinarily of the visible particular Church, *Know ye not (saith Paul to the visible Church of Corinth) That ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? 1 Cor. 3. 16.* And indeed it was the Assembly of the visible Church of Corinth, of which the stranger professed, *That God was in them of a truth,*

1 Cor.

1 Cor. 14. 25. And if there were any weight in that Argument alledged above, to prove that the Church in *Matth. 16. 18.* was meant not the visible, but invisible Church, because it could not be destroyed: then it will as strongly convince, That the Church here spoken of is not meant the invisible, but the visible Church. For the Apostle speaketh of such a Church (or Temple) as may be destroyed: If any man (saith he) destroy the Temple of God, him will God destroy, 1 Cor. 3. 17. When Paul demandeth (2 Cor. 6. 16.) What fellowship hath the Temple of God with Idols? he speaketh of the visible Church, where the Sacraments were administered, whereof he telleth them, they cannot be partakers of the Table of the Lord, and of the Table of Devils, 1 Cor. 10. 21. And the Scripture whereto Paul hath reference (*Levit. 26. 12. I will dwell in them, and walke in them*) hath respect to the visible Congregation of the Church of Israel. In 2 *Thess. 2. 4.* Antichrist is said to sit in the Temple of God which cannot be meant of the invisible Church. The Temple that was said to be open in heaven (*Rev. 11. 19. and 15. 5.*) was not the invisible, but the visible Church.

Ob. 12. The Lords spirituall building (or Temple) whereof the corner stone, and foundation is Christ, is the Church invisible, built by faith, as lively stones upon Christ, 1 *Pet. 2. 7. Ye are Gods building*, 1 *Cor. 3. 9.* and *Eph. 2. 20, 21, 22.* The building are expressly those, who are built on the Doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, and grow up to an holy Temple in Christ, and are the habitation of God through his Spirit. This cannot agree to a visible Church, the members whereof (as our Brethren teach from *Rev. 2.*) may be Hypocrites, who fall from their first love.

Repy. All this doth well agree to the visible Church duely administered. For Christ is the head of the visible Church as well as of the invisible; and therefore also the foundation. The visible Church of Corinth was built upon Christ, as a foundation, and upon none other, 1 *Cor. 3. 10, 11.* And it hath been shewed above (in opening *Mat. 16. 18.* That Christ beleeved on, and confessed, is the Rock (or Foundation) upon which God will build not onely the invisible Church, but the visible also, whereto the Keyes are given. And Christ is the Corner-stone not

onely

onely of the invisible Church, but also of the visible Churches of Jewes and Gentiles. In Christ; an uncircumcised Heathen (but a profest Beleever) may be received a member into any visible Church of Jewes. And a circumcised Jew (but a profest Beleever) may be received a member into any visible Church of Christian Gentiles. The members of the visible Church ought to be built by Faith as lively stones upon Christ, as *Peter* speaketh; otherwise the Lord will cast them out. For living stones in the building are all one with living and fruitfull branches in the Vine. The Vine (whereof Christ speaketh in *Ioh. 15. 1. to 6.*) was meant the visible not the invisible Church. For in the invisible, there be no dead, nor unfruitfull branches to bee cut off, and withered, and cast into the fire, as in the other there be, *v. 2. and 6.* The life of *Peters* living stones doth not weaken or infringe their membership of the visible Church, but establish it rather. What though we grant that hypocrites may be in the visible Church? Yet we say, as *Paul* doth, They come in by stealth, as creepers in. And their dead-heartednesse and hypocrisie, doth not kill the living estate of the other members who are sincere. What though *Paul* call the Church of Corinth Gods building, *1 Cor. 3. 9.* doth he therefore speake of the invisible Church? Surely every visible particular Church is Gods building; or else it is but an humane plantation, and then it will certainly be rooted up, *Mat. 15. 13.* What though the building (in *Eph. 2. 20.*) be built upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles? Cannot that agree to the visible Church? So indeed the Objector argueth; but verily it doth so necessarily agree to the visible Church, that it is in truth, no visible Church, if it be not built upon that foundation. For as the invisible Church is built upon the faith of the foundation laid by the Prophets and Apostles; so is the visible Church built upon the profession of the faith of the same foundation. What though the same building be said to grow up unto an holy Temple in Christ, and to be the habitation of God through the Spirit? Cannot that agree to the visible Church? Doth not *Paul* call the visible Church of Ephesus wherein *Timothy* ministred, the house of the living God? *1 Tim. 3. 15.* And is not the visible Church of Thyatira commanded by Christ for growth in Christ, so that her works were

more

more at the last, then at the first? *Rev. 2. 19.* If God was sometimes pleased so far to honour *Solomons Temple* (a Temple of stones and timber) as to call it his Temple, his House, his Habitation, (as *Mat. 21. 13. Psal. 132. 5.*) Is it a strange thing, or incompatible to a congregation of visible Professors, that they should be called his House, his Temple, his Habitation through the Spirit? That which may agree to any visible Christian (*1 Cor. 6. 19.*) may it not agree to a visible Church of Christians?

Ob. 3. But (saith the Objector) The laying on of stones upon this building, is not the act of In-churching, or of union to a Church; but the joyning of the stones to the building is the union of these stones by faith to Christ, as is expounded, *1 Pet. 2. To whom comming as to a living stone, v. 5. yea Peter writeth this comfortable Doctrine not to men as built up in a Church estate in a single congregation.* For many of these to whom he wrote were dispersed and persecuted, through *Pontus, Asia, and Cappadocia*; and might have, and had union with Christ by faith, without a Church-union.

Reply. What doth this Objection argue, but onely this, that living members of Christ whether in visible Church-fellowship, or out of it, have access to Christ, and are joyned to him by a lively faith in his Name? which we freely acknowledge. But this will not argue, that *Solomons Temple* was not a Type of a visible congregation; which is the point to be proved. May not a visible congregation of Saints come unto Christ, as living stones, and be joyned to him by faith? Yea but the comming of these stones to Christ, and their joyning to him, was not an act of In-churching or of union to a Church, but of union to Christ by faith. But it should be union to a Church if the comparison prove the Point.

Reply. The comparison proveth the Point, though this Text speake nothing of the Church as visible, but as invisible. It is warrant enough from Scripture to make the Temple a type of the visible Church, if other Scriptures doe apply the type of the Temple to the visible Church, though this place of *Peter* should apply it to the invisible Church also. The Church whether it be considered as visible, or as invisible, doth both wayes require the hewing and squaring of the members before they be received ei-

ther by faith into union with Christ, or by blamelesse profession into union with the visible Church; a sincere Beleever, though he hath been hewed by the Ministry of the Law, and squared by the Ministry of the Gospell, and sojoynd by faith to Christ; yet if he shall live in any scandalous corruption either of Doctrine or conversation (which yet may befall a member of Christ) he will yet need further hewing, and squaring (conviction, and profession of Reformation) before he be joynd to the visible Church. The comparison therefore proveth the point in hand, though this Text in Peter speake rather of joyning to Christ, then of joyning to the visible Church. 'What though these dispersed Saints (to whom Peter wrote) were not joynd in Church estate in one single congregation, as being dispersed throughout *Pantus, Asia, Cappadocia*? Yet they were joynd, though not in one single congregation, yet in many particular congregations dispersed up and downe throughout those Countries. For Peter writeth to the Elders set over them, as to Pastors; and to the Brethren as to the flocke, 1 Pet. 5. 1. to 4. And therefore, it is not safely said, 'That these Saints had union with Christ by faith, without Church-union. For they had both union with Christ, and with the visible Church also.

Ob. 4. 'Though in this Type (of hewing and preparing the stones for the Temple) there were signified a morall obligation, That all before they be In-churched into a visible congregation should be converted; how is it proved, That the Church should receive none to a visible congregation, till they be converted? For these are far different. All should be converted, but there is no new Law commanding the Church to receive none into the Church but the converted.

Reply. If that Type of preparing stones for the Temple, imply a morall obligation, That all should be converted, before they be In-churched into a visible congregation: Then it will also imply a morall transgression, if their conversion be not attended, nor regarded before their In-churching. For though these two be different, the duty of members to be converted, and the duty of the Church to admit no members but the converted; yet they are not so far different, but thus far they mutually infer one another, that if it be the duty of such as are to be received into the

the Church to be converted, then it is also a duty of the Church; not to admit such into their Church-fellowship; whom by their fruits they plainly discern not to be converted. For as it is in Church-Elders, so it holdeth by proportion in Church-Members. If such qualifications (as the Apostle specieth, 1 Tim. 3.) be required in those who are to be ordained Elders, then Timothy and the Presbytery with him, are not to admit any to Church-office, whom they see to want such qualifications, or see not that they have them. In which respect they are commanded to lay hands suddenly on no man, nor to be partakers of other mens sins, but to keepe themselves pure, 1 Tim. 5. 22. In like case, when God requirith Saintship (or conversion) in such as are to be admitted members into the Church, then it is the duty of the Church, not to receive such into their Fellowship as they see to want such qualities, yea, or see not some ground to conceive that they have them. Else if they lift up their hands too suddenly for their admission, they will be partakers of other mens sins, and neglect to keep themselves pure.

Obj: 3. The Hewers of stone, or builders of the Temple must typifie Pastors in office, dressing stones for the spirituall building. Our brethren make them to typifie private Christians out of office, and deny that any Pastours as Pastours, doe fit and prepare stones to be laid on the spirituall building. Also none laid stones on that Temple, save only builders by office; but by our brethrens doctrine, only Pastors do not convert souls. There were no stones at all in the Temple of Jerusalem, but choise, and well-squared stones: are there no Members of the visible Church, but the chosen of God?

Reply. We willingly grant that Pastours or Teachers by office, are the principall Hewers and Squarers of spirituall stones, for the spirituall building of the Church. Principall I say, not the only Labourers in this worke, as knowing, that godly Parents, and Masters, Schoolemasters, and Tutours doe afford no small helpe to the preparing of sundry persons unto Church-fellowship. It is an untrue and unjust report, if it be applyed to the Pastours or Teachers in New England; to say, that we make those Hewers of stones to be only private Christians out of office. We have pleaded and proved the contrary in answer to Mr.

Williams, and in other Tracts. If some others who walke in a way of ridged separation, be otherwise minded, we would not their private and singular opinions should be fathered upon us. Though we doe not conceive our selves called to be Pastours to them who are not yet received into our Churches, yet being called to be Pastors to our severall Churches, we attend the conversion of the carnall hearers, and the edification of all. It is more than the Objectour can prove; 'That none but Builders by office laid stones on that Temple. Why might not any lay a stone on that Temple, who had only the gift or skill of Architecture, though they were not builders by office? We do not say, that there are no members of the visible Church, but the chosen of God: But this we say, that none should be laid in the Fellowship of the Church, who are but sandy and miry Professours, and hold forth no sollid firmenesse of a Christian Profession: Though we cannot easily judge, who are the chosen ones of God in his eternall counsell; yet we may descerne a difference between precious and vile, as *Solomons* builders did discerne a difference between Freestones and the common Pebbles of the streets; and as bulchy swellings of stones in the quarry, had need to be hewen and squared that they may lye levell with other stones in the building, and suit the proportion of the house: So we conceive naturall and carnall worldlings, and malignants opposites to grace and truth, had need to be hewn, and plained by the Ministry of the word, that they may lye levell to the Ordinances of God, and to the fellowship of their Brethren, when they come to be laid together in the Church-building. And such as are so prepared, may be accounted choise persons in comparison of many others.

Obj. 6. 'To argue that stones in *Solomons* Temple, were not laid rough in the building: ergo, men unregenerate must not be admitted members of a Christian Church; this is a wanton Argument. for though the Temple might be a type of every Congregation, and the stones of the Temple (a type) of the members of a particular visible Church: yet that the roughnesse of the stones should be a type of ir regeneration, and above all, that the place of hewing these stones should be a type, and that argumentative, to inferre, that the place of our vocation, Re-
generation

generation, Justification, and Sanctification must be without the Church, and that it is necessary we be like a stone perfectly hewne before we bee laid in the Church-building: This is a kinde of Ratiocination, which sollid Divinity will not admit.

Reply. By the same liberty, whereby the Authour of this objection called a former Argument (from Rev. 2. 4.) a bold and rash Argument, by the same he calleth this a wanton Argument. But as the former Argument was taken (if I may so speak with holy reverence) from the Tophicks of Gods fear, lest Churches should come to be ruined, or dissipated (which is farre from boldnesse or rashnesse) so this is taken from the Tophicks of spirituall chastity, (which is contrary to wantonnesse) to keep the Church of God from becomming a cage of every uncleane and hatefull bird. *John Baptist* was not of a wanton or light disposition, but rather of an austere and sad spirit, and yet he taught the necessity of making rough wayes smooth, to prepare men to Christ, and to his baptism: which argueth, *John* did not esteeme it a point of wantonnesse, to account that roughnesse and harshnesse (which usually accompanieth corrupt nature) to be a fit emblem or type of an unregenerate estate. As for that other point of wantonnesse, to make the place of our Vocation, Regeneration, Justification, and Sanctification, that it must be without the Church, and that we must of necessity be perfectly hewn before wee bee laid in the Church-building; It is an inference that followeth not from our Tenet. For though we hold, that men ought to be Saints (and so Regenerate) at least in the judgement of charity, before they be received as Members into the Church, yet we beleve this Saintship and Regeneration is wrought ordinarily not without the Church, but within the Church; that is to say, wrought in such, as in the Assembly of the Church doe attend upon the meanes of grace dispensed by the Ministry of the Church; not in such as live out of the benefit of Church Assemblies, amongst Pagans and Infidells. Nevertheless many may be converted in the Church, who yet are not of the Church. Besides we say further, that many Infants may be borne in the Church, of the Members of the Church, and they if they come to be afterwards regenerate (which often fal-

leth out) they being of the Church are regenerate within the Church, without any prejudice to any Tenet of ours. The like may be said of such as creep into the Church being hypocrites, when they afterwards are converted to unfained sincerity. But this hindereth not the truth of what we beleve and professe, That carnall worldlings and prophane persons, appearing to be such, whilst they are out of the Church, they ought not to be received into the fellowship of the Church; and that such as being borne in the Church doe shew forth the carnall ignorance and prophanenesse of their hearts, when they grow up to ripe yeares, They ought not to be received to the fellowship of the Lords Table.

But of all others, this Inference doth least of all follow from our Tenet, That it is necessary we must be (like a stone) perfectly hewne, before we be laid in the Church building. As he saith, This kinde of Ratiocination, solid Divinity will not admit. So I may say likewise, This kinde of Ratiocination from any Tenet of ours to infer such a consequence as this, no solid Logick will admit, nor any Christian ingenuity (without too much prejudice and partiality) will extort. To be perfectly hewne we doe not expect in this life, till all Church administrations have finished their course, and we our course together, and so come to bee dismissed into the fellowship of that Church, which reigneth above humane frailty in heavenly glory.

¶ SECT. XIII.

THe other Type taken from the Porters of the Temple, whose watchfulnesse suffered none that were unclean to enter into the Temple, was brought for the same end as the former, to illustrate and prove, That none who were discerned to be unclean or vicious should be admitted into Christian Church-fellowship.

Against this is objected:

Ob. 1 If Porters typifie the Ministers of visible Churches, then i. As onely Porters hold out the unclean; so onely Pastors should hold out the scandalous. But you admit the whole Church

Church with equall authority to take in, or refuse Church-members.

Reply. I did not say, That the Porters did typifie the Ministers, but the officers of the visible Churches; which reacheth to ruling Elders, as well as to Ministers, or Pastors onely. And though it did belong to the Porters by office, to see that none uncleane did enter into the Temple; yet any other Israelites (out of regard of publick purity) were bound to discover to the Porters, who they be, whom they knew to be unclean, and to prevent (as much as in them lay) the Defiling of the holy things of God by the fellowship of unclean persons. Hence it was, that the Jewes of *Asia* (though they were not Porters, yet) they complained of it, as a pollution of the Temple; That *Paul* had brought in an uncircumcised Gentile into the Temple, *Acts* 21. 27, 28. wherein though they were mistaken in *Pauls* act; yet it argueth the common care of all the Israelites to prevent the entrance of uncleane persons into the Temple. Nor is it any more power that we allow to the whole Church, then the fellowship of the like care in brotherly faithfulness, which lyeth upon the Elders by office, to prevent (so far as they see just cause) the pollution of the Church by the entrance of unclean members. This is not (as *Mr. Bayly* is pleased to call it) the cheating of the people of the Keyes by such symbolizing; for it alloweth them all that brotherly watchfulness and liberty, or power, which Brethren out of office are capable of.

Ob. 2 If the Temple be a type of the visible Church, then no prophane person, or uncircumcised in heart should meet with the visible Church, to heare the word; for hearing of the word (by such) prophaneth the holy things of God. This you cannot say; for Infidels may be (as you say) fellow-partners with the Church in hearing the word.

Reply. It followeth not, That if the Temple be a type of the visible Church, then no prophane person should meet with the visible Church to heare the word. For this Objector (*Mr. Rubensford* himselfe) confesseth in the next words (in answer to *Mr. Robinson*) That Adulterers, Theeves, and wicked persons did come into the Temple of the Lord, *Jer.* 7. And therefore though the Temple were a type of the visible Church, yet

(by his Argument) prophane persons might come in to hear the word.

2 Though the Temple were a type of the visible Church, yet there was some more regard to prevent ceremoniall uncleannesse in comming into the Courts of the Temple, then now lyeth upon Christian visible Churches in these dayes of the New Testament, whilst the partition wall stood between Jew and Gentile, no uncircumcised person, no Gentile might enter into the Courts of the Temple, so much as to heare the word; if they did, it was a defilement of the place. But now that the partition wall is broken downe, now all sorts of people may enter into the places of our Assemblies to heare the word, without either prophaning the holy Ordinances of God, or without polluting the presence of Gods people. For so did the Infidell Corinthian come in to heare the Prophefying of the Church, 1 Cor. 14. 24, 25.

Ob. 3 *Robinson* holdeth, That *Abrahams* seed, and so all the Jewes were to separate themselves from the world, that they might be a visible Church to God. But we read not, That the Porters were to hold out any wicked person. Yea in *Jer. 7.* professedly they came to the Temple of the Lord, who were Thieves, Adulterers, and wicked persons. And so by that, neither are the Porters of the visible Churches of the New Testament, to hold out unconverted persons, because unconverted.

Reply. 1 If this reason did prove any thing, it would as well argue, That Adulterers, Thieves, and wicked persons are not to be cast out of the Church (which yet our Brethren dare not justify) as that they are not to be received into the Church.

2 Those Adulterers, Thieves, and prophane persons in *Jer. 7.* were either not openly known to be such (and then no marvel, if the Porters admitted them) or else if they were openly knowne, it only argueth a neglect of their charge and office, to suffer such to come in amongst them. For by the Law, such morally unclean persons should either have been cut off from their people, whether by Civill or Church-censure (as learned *M. Gellisy* proveth, and I wave it not) or else, in their first approach into the presence of the Lord, after such wickednesse committed, they should

should have brought a trespasse offering, and other sacrifices, and made confession of their sinnes over the same, before they had been allowed to come to joyne with their brethren in Temple-worship.

Object: 4. Where did our brethren learn to make the Porters of the Temple types of Church officers? There is no arguing from symbolicke types, except where the Spirit of God in Scripture, applieth a type to such a signification or use. By what Scripture will they make legall uncleannesse to typifie the estate of ir regeneration? And above all, how will they make exclusion from the Temple, for legall uncleannesse, a type of rejection from Church-membership for ir regeneration? Nothing more common then legall cleannesse in a person ir regenerate, and legall uncleannesse in a person regenerate. Legall uncleannesse did never hinder any from Church-membership under the Old Testament, albeit for a time it might impead their Fellowship in some services, but ir regeneration did never hinder any from communion in any service, whether of the Tabernacle or Temple.

Reply, 1. To make the Porters of the Temple, types of Church Officers, we learned it of the Lord Jesus. For who is that Porter, of whom Christ saith, he openeth the door of the sheepfold but only the officers of the Church? *Joh. 10. 3.*

2. To make uncleannesse a type, as of other scandalous sinnes, so of ir regeneration, we learned of the Apostle *Paul*, who maketh unbelievers, and unclean or defiled persons all one, *Tit. 1. 15.* But take our Tenet, not as Mr. *Bail* mis-conceiveth, but as our selves propound it, and we shall willingly interpret legall uncleannesse, to mean any open scandalous vice, whether it manifest ir regeneration, or the fall of a regenerate person into open offence. And so the Argument will hold a fortiori. If any legall uncleannesse did exclude an *Israelite* from entrance into the Temple, then any open scandall will exclude a Christian from entering into the visible Church. And if any open scandall, then much more such grosse and heinous scandalls, as are not incident to a regenerate person through infirmity, but are certain evidences of ir regeneration.

It is too vast an hyperbole, to say, Nothing more common
Q 2 then

‘then legall cleanness in a person irregenerate, and legall uncleanness in a person regenerate: For though Hypocrites will sitte *Mint, and Annis, and Cummin,* when they neglect the weightier matters of the Law, yet the most common sort of men are not Hypocrites, but either ignorant or irreligious persons, if they be irregenerate, and make little conscience of any spirituall duty: And Hypocrites themselves, that make most shew of legal cleanness, yet when they are unfaithfull in the greatest matters, who can beleive they will be faithfull in the least?

It is a very unsafe, and indeed an untrue speech, to say, ‘That legal uncleanness did never hinder any from Church-membership under the Old Testament.

The neglect of circumcision was a legall uncleanness, and did cut off a man from all Church-communion with the people of God, *Gen: 17. 14.* Eating of blood was a like legall uncleanness, and did in like sort cut off a man from Church-membership, *Lev: 17. 10.*

It is true what the Objectour saith, ‘That it is a question, ‘whether sinnes very scandalous did keepe men ceremonially cleane from the Temple and Sacrifices.’ But surely such as committed those very scandalous finities, were either to bring a trespassse offering, and other sacrifices, to the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, and to confesse their sins over their sacrifices for their attonement: or else it was a sinfull neglect in the Officers of the Temple, to admit them to fellowship in the holy things of God. And so it is also in Evangellicall Church-Discipline: Penitentiall confession presenteth a man cleane to the Fellowship of the Church, though otherwise unclean.

But when he maketh it a matter out of all doubt, ‘That irregeneration alone was never a bar to keep any from the most Holy and Solemne Services, whether of the Tabernacle or Temple.

He may be pleased to understand, That if he will take our Tenet from our own expressions, and not from his owne forestalled prejudice: Neither amongst us doth irregeneration alone keep any from Church-Fellowship with us. Not irregeneration alone, I say, unlesse it be accompanied with such fruits as are openly scandalous, and doe convincingly manifest irregeneration,

on, as grosse Ignorance, palpable Hypocrisie, or such like spirituall wickednesse. Nevertheless, I conceive (under favour) more positive fruits of regeneration are required in the Church-members of the New Testament, then of the Old.

SECT. XIV.

Against the Argument alledged from *Rev. 22. 15. Without are Dogges, Whoremongers, Idolaters and whosoever loveth and maketh a lye*: It is objected.

Object. 'The place is fouly abused, when it is applyed to the visible Church, where there may be, and ordinarily are Dogs, yea and lyars, *Rev. 2. 2. Idolaters, ver. 14. Napier, Pareus, Marbrat,* expound it of the Kingdom of Glory, for that is the Kingdom spoken of, *Rev. 21. 27.* within that Kingdom cannot enter any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, and lyes, but they which are written in the Lambes booke of life. But it is against all reason, and the Lords Word, that in the visible Church is nothing that defileth, that is, no sinne, but onely those who are written in the Lambes booke of life. This is the very doctrine of *Anabaptists*, though we know our dear brethren hate the sect, and their doctrine.

Reply. Though I attribute much to the judgement of Mr. *Rutherford* (whose objection this is) in matters of Doctrine, yet I must crave leave to depart from his interpretation of this place, and many such like which concern discipline. Doubtlesse when this place excludeth Dogs, Idolaters, Lyars and such like grosse scandalous persons, he meaneth them who are known to be such. And they who are known to be such, are not to be received into the visible Church: nor suffered in the Church, if being received they be found to be such. To admit or tolerate such, were a manifest violation of the order of the Gospell, which forbiddeth the casting of holy things to Dogs, *Mat. 7. 6.* and forbiddeth also Church-communion with Idolaters, *1 Cor. 5. 11* and commandeth the putting away of lying, *Eph. 4. 25.* a vice which *David* would not suffer to abide in his house, *Psal. 101. 7.* And behold *Christ* (of whom *David* was a shadow) was of purer eyes then *David*, and the House of *Christ* (by order from him) should be kept more pure than

than that of *David*. What if *Lyars* were found in *Ephesus*, *Revel.* 2.2. It is neither said, they were received into the Church, (but rather prevented by timely discovery,) nor is it said, they were born withall in the Church; but rather expressly contrary, for *Christ* himselfe beareth them witnesse, I know thou canst not bear them which are evill, &c. And what if *Idolaters* were found in the Church of *Pergamus*? ver. 14. doth not *Christ* expressly blame them for suffering such amongst them?

I deny not *Napier*, *Marlorat*, and *Pareus* do interpret those two last chapters of the *Revelation* of the Kingdome of Glory, the Church triumphant in Heaven, not of the militant Church on earth.

The men I dearly reverence, but yet I dare not deny, but that some others partly by light from *Napiers* principles, but principally by a clearer light received by the holy Ghost, for the interpretation of Prophetickall Scriptures, have with far more evidence of truth, interpreted the same chapters to be a description of the state of the Church of the *Jewes*, after their conversion, upon the desolation of *Rome*. *Brightman*, *Patrickke*, *Forbes*, *Bernard*, all of them well affected to *Presbyterian* Discipline; yet Interpret those chapters of the estate of the *Jewish* Churches here on earth. Their reasons are extant in their books (which are in every mans hand) so that I need not to recite them.

It is true which the objection saith, 'That the Kingdom spoken of *Rev.* 2.2.15. is the same mentioned, *Rev.* 21.27. Of which it is said, That into it shall nothing enter that defileth, or that worketh abomination, or maketh a lye, but they which are written in the Lambes book of life.

But what is this more, then the Prophets have foretold of the New *Jerusalem* on earth? Thy people shall be all righteous, *Esay* 60.21. from henceforth there shall no more come into thee, the uncircumcised, and the unclean, *Esay* 52.1. The Inhabitant shall not say, I am sick: the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity, *Esay* 33.24. I doubt not, *Mr. Rutherford* will acknowledge (and all Orthodox with him) that such as have their iniquities forgiven, are written in the Lambes book of life. 'Yea, but it is against all reason, and against the Lords Word, that in the visible Church, is nothing that defileth, that is, no sin.

It is not every sinne, that defileth a Church, but sin openly knowne, and allowed, at least tollerated and not proceeded against by due admonition, and censure according to the rule of the Gospell. And in that sence, the Lords Word expressly foretelleth, that nothing that defileth shall enter into the Church of the Jewes, *Es. 52.1.* as well as, *Rev. 21. 27.* And why should it be thought against all reason, that after the Whore of *Babylon* destroyed, the Spouse of Christ should appeare in gracious and glorious purity, according to the primitive pattern of the Apostolick Churches? where great grace was upon them all, *Acts 4. 33.* And close Hypocrites (such as *Ananias* and *Sapphira*) were soon discovered, and severely removed. Let no man decline the evidence of this truth, by the wonted evasion of the invisible Church. For take the corruptest times of the Antichristian Apostacy; and even then, none entred into the invisible Church, but such as were undefiled, and whose names were written in the Lambs book of life, *Rev. 14. 1, 4.* unlesse that also be interpretable of the visible Churches of the *Waldenses*, who separated themselves from the Antichristian Synagogues. But in those two last chapters of the *Revelation*, doublelesse greater purity of Churches is promised, not above what was before required, but above what was ordinarily before either attained, or attended.

As for the *Anabaptists*, he saith truly, we neither approve their sect nor doctrine, for their doctrine was the same which *Augustine* taxeth in the *Pelagians*, that the Church consisteth of such just persons, as are perfect without sin. And so *Calvin* reporteth of the *Anabaptists*; at least, of some cheif of them, *Instit. l. 4. c. 1. ff. 13.* which all men know, that know us, we disclaime, as seeing cause to bewaile the manifold infirmitie, of the purest members, of the purest Churches.

¶ SECT. XV.

IN the shutting up the discourse of the Qualification of Church-members, it was noted in the way of our Churches, that it could not bee thought an unreasonable curiosity, but rather held a due and faithfull watchfullnes, to take a due tryall of men by a confession of their sine, as *John Baptist* did, *Mat. 3. 6.* and

and by a profession of their faith, as *Phillip* did, *Acts* 8. 37. And that it was not an excessive austerity in *Iohn*, but an holy faithfullnesse, and godly zeale, not only to repulse the Scribes and Pharisees, *Mat.* 3. 7. but the prophane people also from his baptism, *Luke* 3. 7.

Which *Mr. Baily* divideth into two Arguments, the one from *Mat.* 3. the other from *Acts* 8. and answereth by way of objection against them both.

Ob: I The consequence (saith he) is not good, but a loose kind of reasoning from *Iohn* the Baptist, to all the officers, and body of the Church; from baptism or any sacrament to Church-membership, from the Scribes and Pharisees, and prophane people, to every irregenerate person.

Reply, This reasoning is so far from loosenesse, that I see no colour, why it should not strongly binde, from *Johns* faithfullnesse in dispensing his Baptisme, to urge the like faithfulness in the Ministers of Christ in dispensing Christs Baptisme, unlesse we should conceive the baptism of Christs, inferiour in purity to that of *Johns*, which seemeth to me too grosse for any man of judgement to imagine.

That mention was made of the body of the Church, it was not to infer the power of Baptisme to belong to them, but to imply it to be a seasonable duty in them, to inform their Ministers of any prophane persons, who might offer themselves, or their children to baptism, and by such information to retard their baptism.

And I can but wonder, why he should call it a loose kind of reasoning from baptism to Church-membership, seeing baptism is a Sacrament sealing to us, as other spirituall benefits, to our initiation into Church-membership. Whereupon I conceive it to be an undeniable truth, that to whom baptism (the signe and scale of Church-fellowship) is denied, to them Church-fellowship is denied also. As for that loose reasoning from Scribes, and Pharisees, and the prophane people, to every irregenerate person; that is none of mine, but his owne. All that I did infer from thence was, that as *John* did repulse the Scribes, and Pharisees, and prophane people from his baptism, so the Ministers of the Gospell ought in like sort, refuse to admit any such

such persons to Church-Fellowship, whose hypocrisie (as that of the Scribes and Pharisees) or prophanenesse (as that of the people) did evidently discover their ir regeneration.

Ob: 2 But (saith he) the worst is, that the antecedent is clearly against the places of Scripture alledged. *John* did not exclude, either the Scribes or the Pharisees, or the common people from his Baptisme: He received all that came, both the Scribes, and Pharisees, and *Jerusalem*, and all *Judea*, and all the Region about *Jordan*, requiring no other condition for their admission to his Sacrament, then the confession of sinne, and promising of new obedience: Acts very feasible to ir regenerate people.

Reply. This objection hath been answered above in chapter 2. either *John Baptist* excluded the Scribes and Pharisees and prophane people from his baptisme: or else he made himselfe more unfaithfull in Gods house then the Scribes and Pharisees. For this was a great part of their Temple-pollution, that they made the House of God a Den of theeves, *Mat.* 11. 17. But if *John Baptist* received them to his baptisme, he then made the Church (or House of God) not only a Den of Theeves, but, which is worse, a Generation Vipers. The Scribes and Pharisees were Hereticks in doctrine, Superstitious in worship, notorious Hypocrites in their profession, and covetous Worldlings in their conversation: If that be the worst we say, to say, that *John* repulsed a generation of Vipers from his baptisme, consider if it be not far worse to say, he did admit them.

It is a very groundlesse imagination, to think that *John* admitted to his baptisme all that came, both the Scribes and Pharisees, and prophane people; although the text saith, *There went out to him, Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the Region round about Jordan:* For though from all those parts sundry came to him, yet not all that came to him, were baptised; but such only as being touched with repentance confessed their sins, *Mat.* 3. 6. And indeed wherefore was his baptisme called the baptisme of repentance? but because he received none to baptisme, but such as professed their repentance. As *Peter* exhorted the Jewes first to repent; and then to be baptized, *Acts* 2. 38. But as for the Pharisees and Sadduces, they are spoken of with an adversative particle

parricle, as intimating he did exclude them from his baptism, which he admitted so many others unto. For so the Evangelist relateth it, *There went out unto John, Jerusalem, and all Judaea, and all the Region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sinne.* But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadduces come to his baptism (instead of entertaining them to his baptism) he intertaineth them with a sharpe reproofe, *O Generation of Vipers, &c. Mat. 3. 5, 6, 7.*

Yea but John required no other condition to his Baptism, but the confession of sin, and promise of new obedience, acts very feasible to irregenerate persons.

Yes, John required more, to wit, That they should bring forth fruits meet for repentance ver: 8. Neither doe we require any more, then that men confesse their sin, and professe their repentance, and new obedience, and bring forth such fruits, as doe not prevaricate, and deny such a profession. And though some irregenerate persons may hold forth all these, yet we refuse not to accept such profession, when we see no fruits to the contrary. Whence it was, that in the way of our Churches, it was added in the same place, *We had rather 99 Hypocrites should perish through presumption, then one humble soule belonging to Christ, should sinke under discouragement, by dispaire.*

SECT. XVI.

Ob. 2 IN the Argument from *Acts 8.* for shortnesse sake, I observe (saith he) but one fault, in the consequence, yet a very grosse one: That profession of faith is made a certaine Argument of true grace and sanctification. Will any of our brethren be content to admit their members upon so slender tearmes, as *Phillip*, or any of the Apostles did require of their new converts? will the profession, that Jesus is the Christ, or such a confession, as *Simon Magus* could make, and the rest of the *Samaritans*, after a little labour of *Phillip* among them, be an evident, and convincing signe of regeneration?

Reply. This very grosse fault in the consequence, which *M. Bayly* saith he marketh, is (as his consequences are wont to be) none

of ours, but his owne. *Phillip* admitted none to his baptisme; but upon profession of faith; ergo, none should be admitted members of the Church, without certaine evidence of their regeneration: This inference we leave to himselfe. But surely it is not found in any writing of ours, either in the proposall of this argument, or any other. But all that we would infer from that example of *Phillip*, may be expressed in these consequences.

If *Phillip* required it as a needfull preparative to baptisme, that a Proselite of grown years should beleive with all his heart; then faith unfained is a needfull requisite in a man of grown yeares to Church-membership.

But *Phillip* required in the Eunuch (a Proselite of grown years) as a necessary preparative to his baptism, That he should beleive with all his heart (which is all one with faith unfained) *Acts* 8. 36, 37.

Therefore faith unfained is a needful requisite to Church-Fellowship.

For I take the right of Church-fellowship, and the right to the signe of Church-Fellowship, to be convertible.

Our other consequence is this, if *Phillip* received the Eunuch unto baptism upon the voluntary profession of his faith in Christ, when he saw no cause to suspect the sincerity of it, by any evill fruits; but rather had just cause to approve it, by the testimony of the Angel, and his own conference with him; then the Officers of the Church, may receive a Proselite into the Church, upon the profession of his faith in Christ, when they see no cause to suspect the sincerity of it; but rather to approve it.

But the former is true, *Acts* 8. 37, 38. Therefore the latter.

Let not then *M. Bailly* say, That we would be loth to admit our members upon so slender termes as *Phillip*, or any of the Apostles required of their new converts. For we admit them upon more slender termes, then they required, though we would not willingly admit them upon other termes, then they accepted. *Phillip* required faith unfained; but he accepted the Profession of his faith, such as was not denied with contrary fruits, and so do we; and that upon more slender testimony from men, then the testimony of the Angel intimated to *Phillip* of the good estate of the Eunuch. The Apostle *Peter* required repentance and faith in Christ of those new converts; *Acts* 2. 38. He accepted their

glad some profession, receiving his words, *ver. 41.* which profession neverthelesse, was expressed with such life of gracious affection, that amongst 3000 soules, not one of a thousand proved hypocriticall. *Ananias* and *Sapphira* where but two persons, who proved to be hypocrites: but the Church-members were then not 3000 only, but 5000 *Acts 4. 4.* And *Simon Magus* was but one Hypocrite, and the only one of all the *Samaritans*, that discovered his Hypocrisie afterwards; but all the rest, though they were new converts, yet were enlarged in abundance of illumination, and holy affection, to make up what was wanting in their late conversion, yea and *Simon* himselfe though no better then stony, or at most, then thorny soyle, yet even he might be strongly and deeply affected for a while. For the stony soyle receiveth the word incontinently with joy, *Mat. 13. 20.* And the thorny soyle wanteth not depth of earth, though the stony do.

¶ SECT. XVII.

HAVING thus (by the helpe of Christ) rescued our arguments laid down in the way of our Churches, from the objections, and exceptions taken against them: Let me proceed to rescue in like sort a passage or two in our Apology.

In the Apology chapter 9. we said, we should open the doors of the Church more wide then God alloweth, if we should unwittingly and willingly lay dead stones in the living Temple, if Christ be an head of pure gold, and the Church a golden Candlesticke, how shall we be allowed to put in leaden members?

Against this, it is objected by Mr. *Rutherford*.

Ob. This Argument is against the Lords dispensation, because not without his providence are Hypocrites in the Church.

Reply. It is very unisound arguing from Gods providence, to Gods Ordinance. Many, not only Hypocrites, but prophane and scandalous persons, are not onely in the Church, but in the Ministry also, by Gods providence. But it will not therefore follow, that prophane and scandalous persons should be admitted either into the Ministry, or into the Church, neither of them standing with Gods Ordinance, or Commandement.

Ob. It is not against Gods Commandement, for he alloweth and com-

commandeth the Church to take in Hypocrites; so that they
 'professe the truth; and so commandeth that leaden toes, and
 'members be added to Christ a head of gold. Christ is the head
 'of the Church properly, and according to the influence of the
 'life of God; but he is the Head of the visible Church, as it is
 'such, according to the influence of common gifts, which may
 'be in Reprobates. And they may be this way in Christs body, who
 'are not of his body, as *Augustine* saith.

Reply: It is not safely said, that God commandeth his Church
 to take in Hypocrites. He commandeth indeed his Church (or
 rather the Ministers of it) to call all, both good and bad to the
 marriage of his son; but he doth not command them to take all
 in, till they be clothed with the wedding garment. He comman-
 deth them to preach the Gospel to every creature, *Mat: 16. 15.*
 but to baptize only the disciples, *Mat: 28. 19.* And the infant chil-
 dren of beleivers are counted Disciples, as well as their fathers,
 as hath been shewed elsewhere, in the grounds and ends of chi-
 drens baptisme, lest *M. Rutherford* should thinke, that in alledg-
 ing, *Mat: 28. 19.* we might seem to doubt of the lawfull warrant
 of baptizing children, whereof he warneth us, chapter 9. of his
 peaceable plea, page 266. And though Christ compareth his
 Church to a field, wherein are sown good Wheate and Tares:
 yet he no where commandeth his servants to sow Tares in his
 field, but accounteth the sowing of them to be the worke of the
 Devill, *Mat: 13. 39.* which maketh me to marvell, that the ob-
 jector should say, 'God alloweth, and commandeth his Church
 'to take in Hypocrites. It is true indeed, that God alloweth
 them to take in such as professe the truth, so that they do not re-
 nounce, and falsifie their profession, by a wicked conversation.
 But that is not, because he alloweth them to take in Hypocrites;
 but because he alloweth men to be men: the Church to judge
 of mens holinesse, not by the estate of mens hearts (which are
 certainly known only to God.) but by their outward profession,
 and conversation: 'God never allowed or commanded, that
 'leaden toes, and members should be added to Christ, an head of
 'gold: no more then he alloweth Ministers to build upon a gol-
 'den foundation, wood, hay, stubble, *1 Cor: 3. 12.*

It is a limiting of the grace of Christ, and an injury to the vi-

visible Church, to say (as the objection doth) 'That Christ is the
'Head of the visible Church, as it is such, according to the in-
'fluence of common gifts, which may be in Reprobates. For
Christ is the Head of the visible Church as visible, not only ac-
cording to the influence of common gifts, but of such gifts also
as accompany salvation. Or else the Ministry of the Word and
Sacraments, and censures in the visible Church, were only a Mi-
nistry of common gifts, not of regeneration, or saving edificati-
on, which God forbid.

'It is true, what is alledged out of *Augustine*, that some may be
'in the body, that are not of the body, as ill humours in the na-
'turall body.

But such ill humours as are to be purged out of the body, are
not to be drunk into the body: And it is one thing *de facto*, for
such to be in the body; another thing *de jure*, to allow them a
place in the body.

Another passage in the apology to the same purpose (touching
the qualification of members) against which exception is taken,
was this.

A faithfull servant (or Steward) would admit none into his
'Lords house, but serviceable Instruments, therefore neither may
'the Steward of Gods house (which is a spirituall building) ad-
'mit any but men of spirituall gifts, living stones, sanctified and
'meet for the Lords use.

Ob. The comparison halteth many wayes. 1. All in a Noble-
mans house are not Stewards: you make all the Church to be
Stewards, having the power of the keyes, to put in and out.
'2. Members are received into the Church, not only because they
'are serviceable for the Masters use, but to be made serviceable,
'and to be polished by the Word of God, and care of Pastours:
'but servants are taken into great houses because they are service-
'able. For if they become more serviceable afterwards, it is
'not the intent of the Lord of the house, or of the under-Stew-
ards. 3. The Oeconomy of Princes houses, is no rule for the Go-
vernment of the house of the King of Kings.

Reply. The halting of this comparison lyeth not in the inequa-
lity of the things compared, in that wherein they are compared:
but in the unequal either organ or medium, by which they are di-
scerned.

scerned. A staffe when it is seen partly in the aire, partly in the water, seemeth crooked, though it be never so streight. Look at the ordering of a Noblemans house, or of Gods house, partly as they are, and should be ordered according to the word, and partly as either of them are ordered according to the sinfull customes of men; and so this double medium may easily present an halting. Or take a Noblemans house as it should be ordered by the word, and the Church as it is commonly ordered by men, and so there will be an halting: not otherwise in this case.

For the first, We make not all the Church, Stewards by office (as hath bin often said) but by fidelity, to have a common care of the honour and welfare of Gods house. And such a Stewardly fidelity ought every child and servant in his Lords house to have.

2 For the second, I think it cannot be truly said, That it is not the intent of the Lord of the house, nor of the under-Stewards, that the servants received into his house, should become more serviceable. Doubtlesse the longer any servant continueth in the house, the better he knoweth and doth his Lords will, and ought so to do, and his Lord expecteth it. And as in the house of God, some are received into the Church that they may be made serviceable, but those are children; so in a Noblemans house some children are received (especially the children of Servants) that they may learne to be serviceable.

3. For the third, The Oeconomy of Princes houses, it is true, It is no rule for the Government of Gods house. But surely it is a dishonor to Gods house, if Gods house be more losely and dissolutely ordered, than the house of any earthly King or Lord. Else David was mistaken when he said, *holinesse becommeth thine house, O Lord, for ever, Ps. 93. 5.* Though the Oeconomy of Princes houses be no rule for the ordering of God house; yet me thinks the ordering of Gods house (the King of Kings) might be a rule or patterne, (at least in some proportion) for the Oeconomy of Princes Houses. Methinkes the Stewards of Gods house should blush, to admit such unserviceable persons into Gods house, whom, if themselves were Stewards of a Noblemans house, they could not for shame admit into their Lords house.

22
 Church-members.
 I have been a little while in the air, partly in the way
 of the church, and partly in the way of the world. Look at
 the ordering of a Nobleman's house, or of God's house, partly as
 they are, and should be ordered according to the word, and part-
 ly as either of them are ordered according to the natural customs
 of men, and to this nobleman may easily pretend an ordering.
 Or take a Nobleman's house, as it should be ordered by the word,
 and the church, it is commonly ordered by men, and to that
 will be a help, and not a hindrance in this case.
 For the first. We make not all the Church's stewards by officers (as
 I have often said) but by adding to have a common care of the
 house, and to be stewards of God's house, and such a stewardship
 ought every child and servant in the house to have.
 For the second. I think it cannot be truly said. That it is not
 the interest of the Lord of the house, nor of the under-stewards,
 that the servants received into his house, should become more
 serviceable. No doubt the servants and servants continued in the
 house, the better he knoweth, and doth his lords will, and ought
 to do so, and his lord expecteth so. And as in the house of God,
 some are received into the church, that they may be made service-
 able, but those are children, as in a Nobleman's house some chil-
 dren are received, especially the children of servants, that they
 may learn to be serviceable.
 For the third. The Economy of Prince's house, it is true, it is
 not rule for the Government of God's house. But truly it is a dis-
 honor to God's house, if God's house be more lordly and disor-
 dered, than the house of any earthly King or Lord. This I
 saw manifest when he said, he had been a servant to many lords, and
 for many years. Though the Economy of Prince's house be no
 rule for the ordering of God's house, yet we think the ordering of
 God's house (the King of Kings) might be a rule or pattern (as
 I said in some proportion) for the Economy of Prince's House.
 Methinks the Stewards of God's house should blush, to admit
 such unserviceable persons into God's house, as though if themselves
 were stewards of a Nobleman's house, they could not for shame
 admit into their Lord's house.

FINIS

1629

